

# Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE  
WEST AND SOUTH WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL  
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION  
OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXIX

APRIL, 1934

Number 7

The People of Ostia	Tommy Frank	461
Translation Piece	Frank Justus Miller	494
Treatment of Character in Euripides and Seneca: The Hippolytus	Stan G. Flygt	507
Strawser's Greek Studies	Esther Glaze	517
One Teacher of Classics	Mary E. Moir	527
Notes		532
Thomas Hardy's "Anachlyon Phrase"	Carl J. Weber	
Homerica in Gulliver's Travels	George McCracken	
Benjamin Franklin and Rabelais	Chester E. Jorgenson	
Poe's "To Helen" Once More	R. C. F.	
Book Reviews		541
Mabel Gade, <i>A History of Olynthus</i> (Agard); David M. Rob- inson, <i>Excavations at Olynthus</i> (Duncan); Stephen Blecher Lunt, <i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i> (Fraser); Arthur Fair- banks, <i>Greek Art</i> (Walter Miller); Mary V. Braginton, <i>The Supernatural in Seneca's Tragedies</i> (F. J. Miller).		
Hints for Teachers		546
Current Events		555
Recent Books		557

PRINTED AT  
THE TORCH PRESS  
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the cooperation of the  
Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

*Editor-in-Chief*

WALTER MILLER  
University of Missouri

*Editor for the Middle Western States*

WILLIAM E. GWATKIN, Jr.  
University of Missouri

*Editor for New England*

RUSSEL M. GEAR  
Brown University

*Editor for the Pacific States*

ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY  
University of California at Los Angeles

*Associate Editors*

DUDLEY M. BELL  
Oberlin, Ohio  
FREDERIC S. DUNHAM  
University of Oregon  
W. A. ELLIS  
Lombard, Illinois  
ROY C. FLECKINGER  
University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLASSBORO  
Rushbury Latin School, Boston  
VICTOR D. HILL  
Ohio University

GEORGE HOWE  
University of North Carolina  
FRANKLIN H. POTTER  
University of Iowa  
JOHN BARKER STARNES  
Dartmouth College  
EUGENE TAYNOR  
Washington University

*Business Manager*

WALTER MILLER  
University of Missouri

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

*Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews*, in general to Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Russel M. Gear, Brown University, Providence, R. I.; from the Pacific States, to Arthur P. McKinlay, University of California at Los Angeles, Calif.

*Concerning Special Departments*, to those named at the head of each department.

*Concerning Membership in the Associations:*

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. For the states included in this Association, see the list of officers.

In the Classical Association of New England, to Monroe N. Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

*Concerning Subscriptions* (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

*Concerning Missing Numbers*, to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and so far as the reserve stock will permit.

*Concerning Advertisements*, to Walter Miller, Business Manager, Columbia, Mo.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is printed monthly except in July, August, and September by The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Ia. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75), on single copies 5 cents (total 35 cents).

The membership fee in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with the addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at a special rate. See advertising section.

Twenty-five reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles, book reviews, and notes. Additional reprints, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Cedar Rapids, Ia., on October 16, 1922, and additional entry as second-class matter at Ann Arbor, Mich., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 16, 1922.

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

---

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1934

---

NUMBER 7

## THE PEOPLE OF OSTIA

---

By TENNEY FRANK  
Johns Hopkins University

---

The fourteenth volume of the *Corpus* with its recently published supplement contains an unusually large number of lists of city magistrates, *Augustales*, members of business men's associations and labor guilds, and many epitaphs and honorary inscriptions that yield some specific information about members of such groups. With the aid of these it is now possible to define to some extent the kind of people that made up the various classes of Ostia's population. Unfortunately, however, though the colony had many normal aspects, it was not entirely a typical Roman city. It was a busy seaport town that handled most of Rome's imports. Hence the population was more largely of the laboring classes than in other towns of its size. It also had relatively little farm land attached, so that one finds but few of the old landlord class that usually controlled the administration of Roman municipalities. Finally, its prosperity came rather late — at a time when many emancipated slaves were entering into all the petty enterprises of urban communities. A larger proportion of its population consisted of non-Latin freedmen than in other cities of the same size.

Ostia had grown very slowly during the Republic;<sup>1</sup> the oldest

<sup>1</sup> Brief sketches of Ostia's history are found in L. R. Taylor, *Cults of Ostia*. Doctoral Dissertation: Bryn Mawr (1912); Paschetto, *Ostia, Colonia Romana*;

walls of the town — of the fourth century B.C. — enclosed less than six acres. The Sullan walls enclosed about 180 acres and probably as many as 30,000 inhabitants. During the period that we shall discuss — the first two centuries of the empire — Ostia had about 100,000 inhabitants, many of them living in large apartment houses that rose to four and five stories.

Since large ships could not cross the sand bars at the Tiber mouth outside of Ostia, shippers would, up to the time of Augustus, put in by preference at the splendid harbor of Puteoli, 125 miles further south, and smaller vessels would carry the goods destined for Rome along the coast and up the Tiber directly to the city. At that time Ostia was not a necessary stopping place. But as Rome's imports increased in volume and many cargoes were consigned entirely to Rome, ships began to stop outside the bar<sup>2</sup> and to discharge their cargoes upon tenders and barges that unloaded at the warehouses of Ostia<sup>3</sup> or were drawn up the river by oxen that walked the towpath along the bank the thirteen miles up to Rome. Since Rome, now a city of about 800,000, got every year by the sea route some 8,000,000 bushels of wheat, thousands of tons of marble from Africa, Greece, Asia, and the Carrara quarries, most of her iron and copper, and at least half of her lumber and fuel, wine, and olive oil, not to mention most of her articles of luxury, we may infer that many hundred barges, flatboats, and transfer boats were in constant service.<sup>4</sup> For these harbor boats

Calza, *Guida di Ostia*<sup>2</sup>: Roma, Bastetti e Tumminelli. Calza's *Guida* describes the walls briefly.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo (v, iii, 5) says they either unloaded entirely outside the bar or discharged a part of the cargo till they were light enough to make the passage of the river. Much of the shipping at this time was done in vessels of about fifty to two hundred tons. Claudius gave privileges to men who would build and employ in the grain trade ships of 10,000 *modii*, i.e., about seventy-five tons capacity (Suet., *Claud.* 18). Ships of over 4,000 *modii* (about thirty tons) could not enter the river in Augustus' time (Dionys. iii, xlv, 3).

<sup>3</sup> The older warehouses of the Republic were probably wooden structures and have left no remains. The tufa structures in Region II, Ins. 2, seem to me to date from the late Republic.

<sup>4</sup> On Claudius' harbor two miles north of the Tiber see Lehmann-Hartleben, "Die antiken Hafenanlagen," *Klio, Beiheft* xiv (1923), 182 ff. This port was really a part of Ostia, and the merchandise loaded and unloaded there seems to have passed through Ostia. Trajan added a new basin with warehouses by



seem to have been restricted to thirty-ton loads by the nature of the river mouth. Hence it is that our inscriptions so frequently mention guilds of barge owners, shippers, grain measurers, ferry-men, boat builders, carpenters, smiths, dock guards, and the like.

Let us now examine some of our guild rolls.<sup>5</sup> The owners of barges appear as *lenuncularii* (five different guilds are mentioned) or *codicarii*. We have two guild rolls of the former and fragments of three others. *C.I.L.* xiv, no. 250, from the year 152, lists 125 members; number 251 (192 A.D.) has 258, and numbers 252, 4567, and 4568 add a few more names. There are no slaves on any of the lists. The members are the owners of the transport barges rather than laborers. Of this we can be quite certain, because we know of several *lenuncularii* who were honored with the *sevirate*<sup>6</sup> — which was seldom given without a substantial *quid pro quo* — and of several whose epitaphs reveal evidence of some affluence.<sup>7</sup> We have from Ostia some illustrations of barges like these that show a number of rowers — slaves, of course — under the direction of a steersman.<sup>8</sup> The steersman may well have been the owner, or, if the owner had several barges of this kind, the foreman might be some trusted slave of the owner. I should assume that the 256 guild members recorded on number 251 would be owners of at least so many barges and perhaps of two or three times the number. In the year 62, for instance, 200 *lenunculi* were wrecked by a storm at the harbor in one day and 100 barges with their wheat cargoes burned up near Rome in one destructive fire.<sup>9</sup>

the side of the Claudian port, but Ostia still served as the headquarters of the harbor business.

<sup>5</sup> See the indices in *C. I. L.* xiv, pp. 574 f., and Supp., pp. 810 f., for a list of the various guilds. The *lenuncularii* operated the tenders or barges for loading and unloading and for ferry service. The *codicarii* hauled the freight to Rome on ox-drawn tow barges.

<sup>6</sup> Nos. 8, 5380, 4562, 2 = 251, vii, 21, and 251, v, 5 = 1067. No. 309: a *codicarius* is also *sevir*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 352, 808 = 251, viii, 35.

<sup>8</sup> See Calza, *Not. Scavi*, 1930, 538. The three rowers on one side may represent six for the boat. The picture in the Vatican is reproduced in *Ann. dell' Inst.*, 1866, Fig. 1; Paschetto, *Pontifica Acc. Romana*: Rome (1912), 214.

<sup>9</sup> Tac., *Ann.* xv, xviii, 2.

Now let us examine the longer of these membership rolls (no. 251). Of the barge owners listed at least thirty-four had once been public slaves, as is shown by the names *Ostiensis* or *Publicius*. The town must have been rather generous to its slaves to manumit them and provide (or permit the accumulation of) enough of a *peculium* so that they could go into this enterprise. Some thirty others bear names acquired in the imperial service.<sup>10</sup> Ostia was apparently a place where slaves emancipated by the emperors and the descendants of such slaves could find an opportunity to make a livelihood in independence. Since the imperial service of the *Annona* had an important station at Ostia, some of these men may well have learned of the opportunities of the town while in that service. There are sixty-six on the list that have Greek cognomina, hence mostly ex-slaves, or only a step or two away, and about seventy-five who bear Latin cognomina (like *Primitivus*, *Fortunatus*, *Successus*) of servile connotation. A few of the small remainder may well, to judge from their names, be veterans honorably discharged from the army or navy,<sup>11</sup> and we recall that after 100 A.D. these would be non-Italians. Our conclusion must be that in this list of 256 Ostians whom we may consider working barge-owners — for they had at least to control the use of one barge and a few slaves — there were very few men of Italian stock. Most of them were freedmen or sons of freedmen.

The guild of the woodworkers (*fabri tignuarii*), incorporated

<sup>10</sup> On official inscriptions and in epitaphs *liberti* were supposed to be designated by the letter *L*, though frequently they are not. On guild lists and the like there is seldom room for the *L. Augustales, seviri, scribae*, and other *apparitores* are almost always ex-slaves at Ostia. The Greek cognomen and certain Latin cognomina usually borne by slaves (*Primitivus*, *Januarius*, and the like) indicate libertine station in at least 90 per cent of the controllable instances at Ostia. The presence of an imperial nomen (*Julius*, *Claudius*, *Flavius*, etc.) or of the nomen of members of the important imperial families (e.g., of *Livia*, *Domitia*, *Lollia*, and *Valeria*) is a very nearly certain indication of imperial emancipation or of descent from a freedman.

<sup>11</sup> See the lists collected by Dean, *The Cognomina of Soldiers*. Doctoral Dissertation: Princeton (1916).

about 53 A.D., was rather unusually well represented at Ostia, having 250 members on the list of 198 A.D. (no. 4569). Its meeting place — with four rather large dining rooms for its monthly banquets — was found a few years ago by Calza near the forum.<sup>12</sup> This guild probably ranked rather high among those of Ostia, for not a few of its members appear to have been prosperous. One (no. 374), though once a scribe and apparently an ex-slave, calls himself a father of knights, and he had given 50,000 sesterces to the city in return for honors voted him. We have records of nine woodworkers who became *Augustales*<sup>13</sup> — an honor that implied considerable generosity with ready cash — and two rose even to the town magistracy,<sup>14</sup> while at least one became a Roman knight (no. 314). We must infer, therefore, that, though carpenters and cabinetmakers belonged to the guild, several of them prospered to the point of having shops of considerable size with numerous slaves working for them — and slaves were not in the guild. It would seem that Ostia may well have had furniture factories that disposed of products not only at Ostia but even in Rome.

And yet most of the members of this guild also were of freedman stock. Eighty men of the list just mentioned bear Greek cognomina, about seventy have imperial names, three are called *Ostiensis*, a large proportion have Latin cognomina of humble implication. There are also a number of names that are popular in the army.

In the late second century, at least, the guild appears to have been organized into sixteen decuries of about twenty-two members each and placed under a *praefectus* for the purpose of serving as

<sup>12</sup> *Not. Scavi*, 1927, 350 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Nos. 296, 297, 299, 330, 407 = 4563, I, a, 418, 4656, 4658, 4565, II, 13 = 4569, VIII, 17.

<sup>14</sup> Number 314, Sex. Carminius Parthenopeus; 374, M. Licinius Privatus, *decurionatus ornamentis honoratus*. Number 5 has a son who became *decurio* by *adlectio*, an indication of well-placed generosity. Number 4642 gave the city 50,000 HS. for honoring his son with a seat in the city council. Several others (cf. 299, 418) have retinues of *liberti* or receive honors from the city for generous gifts.

a part of the local fire department. Hence it has been suggested that some outsiders may have been enrolled to aid in this work. But since the Roman government kept *vigiles* (guards and firemen) at Ostia, one hardly sees why the local "volunteer" department should need serious enlargement from men not of the trade of woodworkers.

The guild of shipbuilders (*fabri navales*) seems to have consisted of somewhat humbler folk, probably skilled hired laborers who were not to any extent the owners of establishments. The long membership list (no. 256) has 320 members besides patrons and officers. In this case the patrons are not knights and senators as they usually are in the more prosperous guilds; there are few tombstones of members boasting of honors — in fact, we know of only one member who rose to the *sevirate* (372) and of none that became a magistrate in the town. This seems to have been a real laboring man's guild. However, it did not admit slaves, though the list includes two or three non-citizen immigrants. The names show about the same proportion of ex-slaves as the other two lists mentioned. There are seventy-eight Greek cognomina, more than a hundred pointing to descent from imperial *liberti*; Latin cognomina of the servile sort are numerous, but there is only one *Publicius* and no *Ostiensis*. Names popular among soldiers (Felix, Maximus, Victor, Celer, and the like) are not infrequent; perhaps naval veterans readily found work at Ostia. We need not assume that these were laborers in the imperial naval yard that existed at Ostia, for the imperial yards would be likely to use a constant force of public slaves. More probably these men hired out to build the barges, rowboats, and ferryboats that were needed by the *lenuncularii* and *codicarii*. At any rate this guild, despite the numbers in it, was not a gateway to distinction. Its members were mostly humble, though skilled, free laborers.

These are the three guilds of free folk about which we know most at Ostia, and they are apparently representative. The indices of *C.I.L.* xiv and its supplement will give the names of many others, as to which, however, we have but little information (sil-

versmiths, lime-burners, wagon makers, fullers, wine and oil merchants, tanners, bakers, millers, rope makers, porters, etc.).

When we turn to the municipal aristocracy, the *duoviri*, the *aediles*, the *decuriones*, we find again that Ostia is not entirely typical, for, though there are many honorary inscriptions raised to near-great men at Ostia, most of these are not natives of the town. The imperial guardsmen stationed there temporarily honored their emperors and patrons. The guilds connected with occupations about the harbor were apt to leave records of their respect (or fear) in inscriptions raised to the high officials (the prefects and procurators) of the Roman *Annona* who frequently visited the town on inspection tours.<sup>15</sup> If we subtract such inscriptions, we do not find many men of distinction there, though a few men had villas in the vicinity.

In most municipalities of Italy the local aristocracy — chiefly landlords of the neighborhood — figured largely among the local magistrates, and by election to such offices they became permanent members of the town council (*decuriones*). Miss Gordon<sup>16</sup> has pointed out, however, that among the thousand officials of this kind recorded throughout Italy not a few can be shown to be of libertine stock. At Ostia, Puteoli, and Capua she places the figure at 33 per cent, which is unusually high. This is not wholly surprising, since it was often the ex-slave (trained to hard and careful work and not yet aware of the fact that lucrative work was sordid) who could make himself a financial success and hence a power in the community. Ostia's lists of magistrates and *decuriones*, while showing no single certain instance of a *libertus* in office (though two had received the insignia of the position: 374, 2045), have an unusually large proportion that reveal libertine ancestry. The reasons for this lie, as I have remarked above,

<sup>15</sup> The quaestor of Ostia was at first in charge. Claudius appointed a freedman as procurator of the port, then Trajan or Hadrian substituted an equestrian *procurator annonae*, who had a large force of freedman helpers (Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, 246 ff.).

<sup>16</sup> "The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life," *J. R. S.* xxi (1931), 70. It should be noted, however, that at Ostia the *Palatina tribus* was old and wholly respectable and does not provide a criterion for classification.



in the lack of a landed aristocracy, in the nature of Ostia's enterprises, and in the rather late growth of the town.

Ostia had, of course, long been a colony — not very large — before inscriptions came to be abundant, and there were a few old families living there. Most of the earlier magistrates recorded bear very respectable names (see, e.g., the fragments of the *Fasti*, nos. 4531-4, and *Not. Scavi*, 1932, 189 ff.); but after Domitian's reign suspicious names began to appear rather frequently, though often shielded by the term *eques Romanus*. Antistius Agathangelus (294), Carminius Parthenopaeus (314), Combarisius Vitalis (335), Cornelius Epagathianus (341), Licinius Herodes (373), Lutatius Charitonianus (378), Clodius Eupalus (4632), Flavius (4452), Fabricius (from *Faber*, 354) were all knights and wrote out their names in full with filiation, but their names betray their origin. Antonius (298), Nonius (390), Plotius (400), Nasennius Marcellus (4457) were probably knights of a more respectable type.

Magistrates whose *tituli* record them as officers (members) of guilds are more frequent at Ostia than in other cities. Cornelius was the son of Thallus (5), a member of the carpenters' guild, as was Carminius, mentioned above, and Licinius Privatus (374); Junius Faustus (4142) and Aufidius Fortis (4620) had been grain dealers; Fabius Hermogenes (4642), once a *scriba*, was the son of a *Spurii filius*. Probably these men had retired with some substance before offering themselves as candidates for high office, but to a Roman it would have seemed significant of Ostia's social mediocrity that members of the town council cared to have their connection with trades recorded on their epitaphs, even if it were possible for such men to hold those offices.

There are other officials of whom we know little except that they were of libertine stock. For instance, Sergius (411), Silius (415), Veturius (431), Marius Primitivus (4553, cf. 5327), and Valerius Eutyches jun. (4676) were sons of *sevir*, i.e., of *liberti*; Publicius (4143) had a name that pointed to public service; Celerius Amandus (321) was the son of a woman recorded as *Sp. filia*; the parents and the wife of Aemilius Hilaria-

nus (332, note the cognomen) bore Greek names; and there are others of the same type.<sup>17</sup> As we have said, Ostia's successful men were to a large extent of this class. The town may well have been fortunate in being governed so largely by "self-made" men, but one must notice that in this respect Ostia resembled freedman colonies like Corinth and Urso rather than the old municipalities of interior Italy.

We come now to the *Augustales* and *seviri* of Ostia, the *liberti* who were especially honored by the town. Many fragments of their lists have recently been found (nos. 4560-3) and many of their epitaphs have long been known. We have over two hundred names of them and, except for a very few that give filiation, they are, of course, ex-slaves. They were likely to record their occupations if they had attained to some petty chairmanship within their respective guilds. And since the elevation to the *sevirate* implies that they had each acquired a few thousand dollars since manumission from slavery, it is interesting to see what kind of work made such success possible. One is a wine merchant (397); nine<sup>18</sup> belong to the guild of woodworkers (*fabri tignuarii*: they doubtless are owners of lucrative establishments); number 297 belongs to the guild of *fabri*; five<sup>19</sup> run loading barges; M. Junius Diogenes (4562, 3) has his name on brick stamps (5308, 29);

<sup>17</sup> The family of Lucilius Gamala was distinguished for its generosity for nearly two centuries (375, 376). The first man of the family known appears as *duovir* in 19 A.D. The cognomen would seem to indicate Syrian connections; perhaps his name derives from Lucilius Hirrus who was Pompey's legatus in Syria. The *duoviri* of the newly discovered list (*Not. Scavi*, 1932, 189 ff.) date from 108 on. A. Manlius *Augustalis* and G. Julius Proculus of 108 and M. Valerius *Euphemiatus* of 109 bore names that reveal humble ancestry. M. Lollius Paulinus, a *duovir* of 166 A.D. (4148, cf. 363), bears a name of great distinction in Roman history a century before. There can be little doubt, however, that he descends from some freedman of the very wealthy Lollia Paulina, once wife of Caligula and murdered by Agrippina. It is surprising how frequently we meet among the carpenters and boatmen of Ostia names like Lollius, Valerius, Volusius, Furius, Statilius, so famous for political tragedies at Rome in the days of Tiberius and Claudius.

<sup>18</sup> Nos. 296, 297, 299, 330, 407 = 4563, I, 2, 418, 4656, 4658, 4565, II, 13 = 4569, VIII, 17.

<sup>19</sup> Nos. 8, 5380, 4562, 2 = 251, VII, 21, 1067 = 251, V, 5 — these are *lenuncularii*; no. 309, a *codicarius*.

one trades in Spain (397); two belong to the guild of grain measurers (309, 4140: they probably had slaves who did the actual work while they took the contract); there is also an *argentarius* — whether a dealer in silverware or a banker (405), and, to judge from the decorations on the tomb, number 393 is a miller. It is interesting to find that several men who had risen to the sevirate had once been public slaves,<sup>20</sup> while more than two score came from service in the imperial household (Julii, Claudii, Livii, Aelii, Flavii, etc.).

At Ostia, if anywhere, Augustus' shrewd institution of the *Augustales* as a freedmen's guild of distinction had justified itself. His chief purposes may have been to have the more successful of the lowest class contribute to the needs of the towns and to bind them in loyalty to the imperial house, and the organization doubtless accomplished what he desired. But the social consequences of the institution were of larger value. Since Rome's immigrants had not come in as free people but as slaves, the middle classes of Rome must be supplied from emancipated slaves or not at all. But ex-slaves were apt to be discontented, if not antisocial, and to be hampered by the sense of inferiority that Roman social customs were ready to impose. By this new institution the city officials were compelled to select and honor year after year the more successful of the *liberti* and to post their names in a prominent place. This act invited amity, created an interest in the city, inspired self-confidence, and demonstrated that Roman society could make a respectable place for them. It is not surprising that so many sons of *Augustales* rose to the local magistracies and to the knighthood. Ostia is one of the best places in which to study the educative power of this remarkable social institution, which did much to save the Roman world from the worst consequences of slavery.

The inscriptions of Ostia give all too little information about the many traders that resorted to this harbor. Some were certainly Ostians, but it is likely that the more important citizens who were in trade lived at Rome, and it is certain that the bulk

<sup>20</sup> Nos. 290, 291, 4560, 2: *Ostienses*; 405; 406: *Publicii*.

of imports was carried by neither of these groups but by citizens of the exporting cities in Asia, Syria, Egypt, Africa, Spain, and elsewhere. In the late second century the three sides of the large piazza behind the theatre were used as unclosed *stationes*, or offices, for many foreign trading groups, as appears from the mosaic inscriptions on the floor.<sup>21</sup> More than half of these inscriptions are lost, but we still can identify the spaces allotted to the shippers (*navicularii*) of Carthage (no. 18), Hippo Diarrhytus (12), Missua (10), Musluvi (11), Gummi (17), Sabrata (14), Curubis (34), Sullethum (23) — all of Africa — and of Alexandria, Egypt (40), Narbonne, Gaul (32), and Cagliari in Sardinia (21). Then there are about twenty which — though not lettered — have decorations of ships, dolphins, or lighthouses that seem to refer to shipping.<sup>22</sup> There are also some general designations like *navicularii et negotiantes* (15, 16) and *navic. lignariorum* (3). All this would seem to indicate that the traders were in general foreigners, as one would also infer from other Ostian inscriptions of the *domini navium Afrarum* (4142), *domini navium Carthaginensium* (99), and *navic. maris Hadriatici* (409). However, there are also offices for the caulkers and rope makers (1), for the *codicarii* (43) and the *pelliones* (2, dealers in hides and leather), which may well be local guilds.

Furthermore, quite apart from these offices, we have mention in Ostian inscriptions of a guild of Ostia itself called *navicularii Ostienses* (3603); a *collegium geni fori vinarii* (430: they may be local retailers of wine); a *corpus vinariorum urb. et Ost.* (318); and a *corpus mercatorum frumentariorum* (161, 303, 4142, 4234, 4620-22). We are, therefore, not yet certain about the provenance of the traders. However, since Claudius gave special favors to citizens and Latins who would build and operate for at least six months per year ships of 10,000 *modii* (about 70 tons) on Roman contracts,<sup>23</sup> we may infer that Romans had hesitated to go into shipping except for a special reward and also that

<sup>21</sup> Calza, *Bull. Com.* (1916), 178; *C. I. L.* xiv, 4549.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., 9, 22, 25, 26, 27, 32, 35, 36, 42, 45, 46, etc.

<sup>23</sup> Suet., *Claud.* 18.

Roman shippers probably did respond to the offer of Claudius. Unfortunately, while we know that the great commercial portico was built with the theatre under the Augustan regime, we do not know when it came to be used for shippers' offices. Calza thinks it was so used from the beginning;<sup>24</sup> but the few mosaics of the lower Augustan level so far found do not seem to refer to these shippers. It is probable that during the Augustan period the publicans still took the contracts to bring in the state grain and that they hired any boats available (usually those of the shipping harbor) for the purpose, that Claudius tried to encourage Romans to go into the business in order to get more adequate service, and that not a few people of Ostia did so. We may, in consideration of phrases like *navicularii Ostienses* (3603), assume that citizens of Ostia were to some extent engaged in trade, even if the evidence of the portico inclines us to the view that foreigners were the most important carriers.

One word about the slaves of the town. Of course, relatively few are mentioned on the inscriptions, for we have no large *columbaria* here corresponding to those of Rome built for the extensive *familiae* of Livia, Statilius, and Marcellus. But we must assume that the actual work — the rowing, the loading and unloading, the warehouse work, the manning of merchant ships, the measuring of the grain, much of the boat building and house construction, most of the office work of the companies and of the state grain service — would fall to the slaves. In a busy harbor town like Ostia more than half the personnel would probably be servile. We have one list of Ostia's public slaves and freedmen, those engaged presumably in the water, street, and sewer service, and perhaps in the municipal offices (255). It contains eighty-one names. Sixty are freedmen, more than half having been emancipated by the city itself, as appears from the *nomen Ostiensius*, and — a pleasant feature — those that are still slaves have their names set in, so as to allow room for a *nomen*. Presumably every public slave of the town had reason to expect emancipation. And we have seen above that not a few of them

<sup>24</sup> *Loc. cit.*



prospered. Such seems to have been the spirit of the town, and we need not doubt that private owners were as liberal as the public. Fifty of the eighty-one bear Greek names, a fact that helps us understand why the oriental cults are so strongly represented at Ostia.<sup>25</sup>

To summarize: The harbor colony of Ostia rose to prosperity only in the Empire and had a very small landholding population of the old Roman type. It was a city of hard-working folk, a majority of whom were doubtless slaves. Though an immense amount of traffic passed through the harbor, giving profitable work to thousands of *entrepreneurs*, the most profitable trade was largely in the hands of outsiders. The guilds of boatmen, consisting of owners of barges, tenders, flatboats, and ferries, were large, and the members made a comfortable living; the same may be said of the boat builders and of the grain measurers who were engaged chiefly in the service of the state grain department. The woodworkers seem to have rather distinguished themselves, for an unusual number of them seem to have attained competence and some office of distinction. However, most of these people came not from the old agrarian municipalities of Italy but rather from the drifting groups of emancipated slaves that sought work at such towns as this. Here slaves and freedmen were treated with generosity. The political aristocracy of the town were to an unusual degree men of recent families who seem to have won their limited success in trade and industry. Very few of them were strikingly rich. There is no evidence here that trade and industry proved very lucrative. Quite in harmony with the type of people found in the town is the dominant religion. The abundance of references to the cults of Mithra, Cybele, and Isis is to be explained in part by the passage of eastern traders but chiefly by the nature of the city's own population.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Cults of Ostia*, 97.

## TRANSLATION PLUS<sup>1</sup>

By FRANK JUSTUS MILLER

In an editorial in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*,<sup>2</sup> on "Translation à la Mode" I made the point that the illegitimate use of translation-helps in preparing the lesson assignments is fostered by the fact that translation of the Latin text is so generally the main objective, that is, translation for the sake of translating; and I suggested that other important objectives, or ends, might be set up, to the attainment of which translation would be the means. It was with this thought in mind, when our president invited me to a place on the present program, I replied that I would offer a paper on the subject of *Translation Plus*, that is, those matters over and above and in addition to translation.

When I consider these "matters over and above," I think of the authors into whose works the process of translation leads us, whose works seem to me matters of chief concern; and I am going to try to sort out the contents of these works, considered as objects of our study, and present them not in any exhaustive fashion but only by means of the merest mention, with illustrative material, so far as my space will permit, and that merely as *obiter studia*, to be noted and enjoyed as we progress in the business of our translation of the text.

I find as first content, then, the *thought* or *meaning* content. What is the author's subject matter and what is he saying about it? This is obviously our first business. It goes without saying and needs no comment. But then what does he *mean*? This is not so simple. His statements need interpretation.

I note next what I may call the *factual* content. This includes

<sup>1</sup> Read at the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at Williamsburg, Va., April 13, 1933.

<sup>2</sup> XXVII (1932), 241 f.

all contributions which the work in hand makes to our knowledge of history, biography, geography, philosophy, etc. These contributions may be extensive, as forming the very substance of the book, or they may be casual, but none the less for that reason to be noted and appraised.

The most interesting of these fact contents have always seemed to me to be the casual glimpses afforded us of the public and private life of the Greek and Roman world. No writer living in that world can fail to give some such glimpses of the life about him, no matter on what subject he may be writing. Hence the archaeologist in the field of actual exploration has always found valuable assistance in the field of classical literature. The most notable application in our time of this principle is to be seen in the recent work of our own Walter Miller, the publication of whose three volumes on the Greek drama as reflecting the arts and crafts of Greece, a work which he has cleverly named *Daedalus and Thespis*, has recently been completed.

His was a work demanding the ripest scholarship and the most unconquerable industry. But any reader of any Greek or Latin author, of however unripe scholarship, if he be open eyed and eager hearted and if his mind be not altogether centred on the mere translation of the text before him, may get glimpses into ancient life for himself. We can all recall, from even our earliest reading, these delightful casual glimpses of ancient life. Personally, I have not yet forgotten the thrill which came to me from reading for the first time Ovid's story of Cadmus and his sowing of the dragon's teeth. To the poet his story was the main thing. But when he would describe how armed men sprang up from the furrows, first helmeted heads, then shoulders, breast, arms, and at last feet, he likens these to the to him familiar pictures on the curtain of the Roman theatre (*Met.* III, 111 ff.):

*Sic ubi tolluntur festis aulaea theatris,  
surgere signa solent primumque ostendere vultus,  
cetera paullatim, placidoque educta tenore  
tota patent imoque pedes in margine ponunt.*

So, when on festal days the curtain in the theater is raised, figures of men rise up, showing first their faces, then little by little all the rest;

until at last, drawn up with steady motion, the entire forms stand revealed, and plant their feet upon the curtain's edge.

And the thrill to me was the discovery from an original, contemporary source, that in the Roman theatre the curtain was unrolled *upward* from the stage floor, just the opposite of our own theatre usage.

Vergil as a boy must often have watched a blacksmith at his forge, and it was inevitable that somewhere in the poet's work he should draw upon that familiar background. Thus it is that in the fourth *Georgic* (and again in the eighth *Aeneid*) he describes such a scene, the shop of Vulcan and his one-eyed smiths (*Geo.* iv, 170 ff.<sup>3</sup>):

*Ac veluti lentis Cyclopes fulmina massis  
cum properant, alii taurinis follibus auras  
accipiunt redduntque, alii stridentia tingunt  
aera lacu; gemit impositis incudibus Aetna;  
illi inter sese magna vi bracchia tollunt  
in numerum, versantque tenaci forcipe ferrum.*

And just as when the Cyclopes hasten on the thunderbolts from the tough lumps of metal, some pump the air in and out of the bull's-hide bellows, others dip the hissing bronze in the water tub.

Here we have the whole picture — the forge, the bellows, the anvil, the forceps, even the water tub; and, best of all (be sure the poet would not miss it), the rhythm, beat out by the huge hammers of the two attendant smiths, echoed by the metrical rhythm of the line that describes it.

From Caesar we learn pretty much the whole round of the Roman art and practice of offensive and defensive warfare, both on land and sea; and from Cicero's *De Senectute*, as well, of course, as from Vergil, we gain a wide and intimate knowledge of the agricultural theories and practices of the time.

From such passages as those cited above, casually met, but definitely appraised for their factual value, the young student should, in addition to the mere translation of his authors, acquire a taste for the study of Roman life which may well in his later work produce rich results.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Aen.* viii, 449 ff.

The third content of our authors to which the process of translation should lead us is the *art* content, and in especial the *rhetorical* art, the revelation of all the fine things that can be done with words as an accurate and felicitous expression of thought. To watch any one functioning at his best in his chosen field of art or craft is a means of culture; and to follow a Latin author, any author, through the development of his work in hand, concerning ourselves not alone with his meaning but with the methods and devices by which he clarifies, beautifies, and strengthens that meaning — that is an education in the finest of the arts, the art of expression of thought, the art of speaking and writing.

In treating of this rhetorical content, I must necessarily pass over the more familiar devices for this clarifying, beautifying, and strengthening of expression, which we call the figures of speech. I only urge that these treasures of speech be not ignored as they are met in reading but that they be inspected, collected, and classified as well worth the closest study. What is the purpose of these figures? What, for us, do they do to the passage in hand — simile, metaphor, personification, epithet, apostrophe, and many other devices? What is our reaction to them as we come upon them? Do we *have* a reaction? When, for instance, we come upon that curious, cart-before-the-horse cry of Aeneas (*Aen.* II, 353):

*moriamur et in media arma ruamus*

Let us die and rush headlong on the arms of the foe,

do we notice at all the strangely inverted order of the two acts? If we do, do we put it down to the temporary lapse of the poet's attention or to metrical exigency? Or do we seek for the real purpose of that evidently intended variation from the natural order?

Do we feel the force of an appeal to the far distant and long past as present here and now? And do we realize what Ovid actually does when he steps out of his proper rôle of story-teller, becomes a ring-side observer of the event he is describing, and in his own person addresses an actor in it? For thus he, Ovid, of the Rome of his day, speaks to Narcissus, of the far mythical age (*Met.* III, 432 ff.):



*Credule, quid frustra simulacra fugacia captas?  
quod petis, est nusquam; quod amas, avertere, perdes!  
ista re percussae, quam cernis, imaginis umbra est;  
nil habet ista sui; tecum venitque manetque;  
tecum discedet — si tu discedere possis!*

O fondly foolish boy, why vainly seek to clasp a fleeting image? What you seek is nowhere; but turn yourself, and the object of your love will be no more. That which you behold is but the shadow of a reflected form and has no substance of its own. With you it comes, with you it stays, and with you 'twill go away — if you can go away!

Here the poet does not summon the past and distant to the here and now. He does a more amazing thing: he takes *himself* to that far past and distant scene and, by the magic of his art, takes us, his readers, with him. It is a sort of apostrophe in reverse, in which he frequently indulges.

Leaving now these more familiar examples of the rhetorical art, I wish to speak of certain other rhetorical devices which cannot be called figurative. I present these without thought of sequence, for they have no natural sequence.

1. *Rhetorical effect of the variation of the normal word order.* The order of words in a Latin sentence is not helter skelter any more than is the English order. There is a natural order in each, and deviation from this on the part of a skilful writer is sure to be aimed at some rhetorical effect. When, therefore, this deviation is observed in a Latin sentence, the translator has no choice but to carry this same deviation over into his English and so preserve undimmed the same effect.

There are countless illustrations of such deviation in Latin, but it is a constant, too often lost battle to get this recognized by the young translator, with the result that the emphasis intended by the writer is lost. An instance will suffice to illustrate this:

The sixteenth ode of Horace's second book is on the subject of *Otium*, which is hard to define by one particular meaning but may be taken as *surcease* from the care or pain that just now afflicts one. It is generally rendered, though not always happily, as *ease* or *peace*.

Thus Horace:

*Otium divos rogat in patenti  
 Prensus Aegaeo . . . .  
 Otium, bello furiosa Thrace,  
 Otium, Medi pharetra decori —*

These opening lines of the ode fairly shriek its logical subject, a subject emphasized both by its place at the beginning of the sentence, where the grammatical subject normally comes, and by its triple repetition. But notwithstanding this, the lines are too generally jerked into their conventional order, Horace's obvious intention ignored, and we have:

He who is caught out on the open Aegean asks the gods for peace,  
 and away goes the emphasis.

But our English is not so helpless. We, too, can say:

Peace does he ask of the gods, who is caught out on the open Aegean;  
 peace, war-drunk Thrace; peace, the Medes, with quiver bedecked.

Again, the logical subject of *Odes* III, 3 is the first line:

*Iustum et tenacem propositi virum,*

though syntactically this is the object of the verb in the fourth line. Read in the normal, unemphatic order, these words would stand in that line instead of in the first — and their importance has oozed away. But read as Horace wrote them, they stand out clear and distinct, and we know at once that this ode is going to talk about "the man who is right and firm-fixed in his righteous purpose," and we are ready to hear that such a man "neither the hot blood of citizens clamoring for evil measures, nor a menacing tyrant's frown, can shake from his firm resolve, nor Auster, blustering lord of the restless Adriatic, nor the mighty hand of thunder-hurling Jove."

2. *Dramatic Suspense.* Related to the device just named, there is a form of emphasis which is more than mere emphasis. It has a very dramatic quality, involving suspense, developing into shocking surprise and horror. This suspense is obtained by withholding the revealing word until the last, an order which, of course, breaks across the normal word order.

Naturally dramatic suspense would be employed only in drama

itself or in highly dramatic narrative. Such a case is found in Ovid's account of Jove's speech in the council of the Gods, when the question of the safety of the earth-dwelling demigods is before the house (*Met.* I, 196 ff.) :

*An satis, O superi, tutos fore creditis illos,  
cum mihi, qui fulmen, qui vos habeoque regoque,  
struxerit insidias notus feritate — Lycaon?*

Or do ye think, ye gods, that they will be safe, when against *me*, who wield the thunderbolt, who have and rule over you, one has laid snares, well known for his savagery — Lycaon?

No wonder that this startling revelation is at once followed by an outcry of horror.

Seneca is the past master of this device of dramatic suspense, and it is a notable feature of his plays. The tragedy of Oedipus has been mounting higher and higher as the king first discovers that he has slain his father and is now insanely pressing on to know the other awful truth, which will complete his ruin. He has forced from the reluctant old shepherd the disclosure that he himself was that little baby boy with pierced ankles, given to the shepherd to be exposed on Mount Cithaeron. But he must know more: "Who was he? Of what sire begot? Of what mother born?" And Phorbas, reluctantly handing out slow reply, word by word (line 868) :

*Coniuge est genitus — tua*  
Of wife was he born — thine own.

Space forbids me to multiply instances of this fascinating device for tragic effect, though instances abound; but I cannot refrain from citing an instance used for comic effect by Horace in the well-known line from his *De Arte Poetica* (139) :

*Parturient montes; nascetur ridiculus — mus.*  
The mountains shall conceive; there shall be born  
a funny little — mouse.

Here dramatic suspense, the holding up of the key word until the last, gains added effect by the fact that this last word is a monosyllable, an ending avoided in dactylic hexameter verse as being too abrupt. But in this case an abrupt ending is deliberately

sought; for, after all the ponderous pother of procreative activity by the mountains, the outcome is not leviathan or behemoth but just a funny little mouse.

3. *Dramatic Afterthought*. This is a device somewhat kin to dramatic suspense in that it involves the final word or words of a sentence; but it is different from suspense in that it comes, not as something planned and led up to for dramatic effect, but as something which has just occurred to the speaker as a second, or after thought. These last words should be preceded by a slight pause, giving time for the after thought to take form. This device also is a favorite with Seneca and dramatically very effective. Instance Amphitryon's words anent Hercules, who is at present in the Lower World, whence, some say, he never can return (*H. F.* 276-7):

*Subitusque ad astra emerget; inveniet viam —  
aut faciet.*

Suddenly to the upper world will he come forth; he'll find a way — or make one.

So Hercules, in the same play (973), in his mad boasting says:

*Videat sub Ossa Pelion Chiron suum,  
in caelum Olympus tertio positus gradu  
perveniet — aut mittetur.*

Chiron shall see his own Pelion 'neath Ossa; and Olympus, set third in order, shall reach clean to heaven —

and now the afterthought —

or else I'll hurl it there!

At the last (1340), awaking to the necessity of continued life after the terrible deeds of his madness, he prays to Theseus:

*Redde me infernis precor  
umbris reductum, meque subiectum tuis  
substituere vinclis: ille me abscondet locus —*

Take me back, I pray thee, and restore me to the nether shades; put me in thy stead, loaded with thy chains. That place will hide me —

and then comes the sickening afterthought —

*Sed et ille novit*  
But it, too, knows me.

4. *Rhetorical Devices of Asseveration.* The practice of swearing as a means of strengthening a statement, affirmative or negative, is very common and very old. Its strength lies either in an appeal to some holy object or person as witness: "by my father's beard," "by my mother's bones," "by Heaven," "by the most high God," *me Hercule, Ecastor, me dius fidius*; or else the statement is strengthened by the staking of one's own life upon its truth: "Cross my heart and hope to die," "may I perish," "may God curse me," etc., if this is not so. These oaths have no literary value, do not rise into the realm of rhetorical art, even if they are not degraded by association with the vulgar and obscene.

But literature furnishes many illustrations of highly beautiful and forceful oaths, richly repaying study, as, for example, Ruth's pledge to Naomi:

The Lord do so to me and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.

And the people said of Jonathan:

As the Lord liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground.

Affirmative attestation is frequently made in the name of the permanence of natural forces. The most familiar example of this, as perhaps the most beautiful, is found in Aeneas' elaborately oriental compliment to Dido (*Aen.* i, 607 ff.):

*In freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae  
lustrabunt convexa, polus dum sidera pascet,  
semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.*

While to the sea the rivers flow,  
While o'er the mountains' rounded sides the shadows drift,  
While the vault of heaven shall feed the stars,  
So long thine honor and thy name and praises shall abide.

A passage in Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus* perhaps has this passage in view but gives, after Seneca's fashion, with greater elaboration, the appeal to the permanence of natural forces (1576 ff.):

*Vere dum flores venient tepenti  
et comam silvis hiemes recident,  
vel comam silvis revocabit aestas  
pomaque autumnno fugiente cadent,*



*nulla te terris rapiet vetustas.*

While flowers shall come again as spring grows warm;  
While winter shall strip the foliage from the trees,  
And summer to the trees recall their foliage;  
While fruits shall fall as autumn takes its flight, —  
No lapse of time shall snatch thee from the world.

Then, without break, the chorus shifts from this appeal to the permanence of nature in support of the affirmative to an appeal to the impossible in nature in support of a statement in denial:

*ante descendet glacialis ursae  
vel fretum dulci resonabit unda,  
ante descendet glacialis ursae  
sidus, et ponto vetito fruetur,  
quam tuas laudes populi quiescant.*

Sooner shall crops of wheat spring from the deep;  
Sooner with sweet waters shall the sea resound;  
Sooner the icy Bear come down and bathe in waves forbidden,  
Than shall the nations be silent in thy praise.

These last five lines introduce us to the finest flower of literary negation, affirming that the utterly impossible in nature shall happen before that which is now proposed. This appeal to the impossible gives name to the rhetorical device, *ἀδύνατα*, "impossibilities."

This device is especially adapted to highly dramatic narrative, to fiery oratory, and to the tragic drama itself. Its use occurs in Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Propertius, and Seneca. I hesitate to cite Hippolytus' savage and most ungentlemanly speech anent women, but it is one of Seneca's best examples. The young woman-hater thus bursts out upon Phaedra's nurse, who has been urging him to associate more with the ladies of the court (*Hip.* 566 ff.):

*Detestor omnes, horreo, fugio, execror.  
sit ratio, sit natura, sit dirus furor,  
odisse placuit. ignibus iunges aquas,  
et amica ratibus ante promittet vada  
incerta Syrtis, ante ab extremo sinu  
Hesperia Tethys lucidum attollet diem,  
et ora damnis blanda praebebunt lupi,  
quam victus animum feminae mitem geram.*

I abominate them all, I dread, shun, curse them all.  
 Be it reason, be it instinct, be it wild rage:  
 'Tis my joy to hate them.  
 Sooner shall you mate fire and water;  
 Sooner shall the shifting Syrtes give friendly passage to ships;  
 Sooner shall Tethys from her far western shore bring in the dawn,  
 And wolves gaze on does with caressing eyes,  
 Than I, my hate o'ercome, have kindly thought for woman.

But now, to atone for these rough words, I will close these examples by picturing for you the discomfiture of a man by a woman's tongue and in no less positive and stinging fashion. Lycus, lowborn adventurer and usurper, in the absence of Hercules in the lower world, has the hero's wife, Megara, in his power. To further his own ends he makes her a brutal offer of marriage, ending (*H. F.* 371 ff.):

*Continge dextram. quid truci vultu siles?*

Touch hands with me. Why stand grim-faced and silent?

And Megara bursts out upon him:

*Egone ut parentis sanguine aspersam manum  
 fratrumque gemina caede contingam? prius  
 extinguet ortus, referet occasus diem,  
 pax ante fida nivibus et flammis erit  
 et Scylla Siculum iunget Ausonio latus,  
 priusque multo vicibus alternis fugax  
 Euripus unda stabit Euboica piger.*

I touch a hand stained with my father's blood and with my brothers' double murder? Sooner shall the east extinguish, the west bring back, the day; sooner shall snow and flame be in lasting harmony, and Scylla join the Sicilian and Ausonian shores; and sooner far shall swift Euripus with his changing tides rest sluggish on Euboea's strand!

And Lycus probably understood that his suit was rejected!

5. I should like to go on and dwell on the *Rhesis*, that curious monolog that is not a monolog, but a dialog between two conflicting selves, showing high emotional tension at some parting of the ways. Hamlet's so-called soliloquy is one good example of *rhesis*, and our classics are full of others. Ovid's picture of Medea's struggle between love for Jason and filial devotion (*Met.*

vii, 11 ff.) is probably the best as well as the best known in classical literature.

6. Then there is that curious prayer, often recurring, which consists of first calling down a blessing on the one of whom a favor is to be asked and then the voicing of the petitioner's own request. This is known as the *bargain prayer* and needs study to be understood and appreciated. Just one example from Vergil: One shepherd says to another (*Ecl.* ix, 30):

*Sic tua Cyrneas fugiant examina taxos,  
sic cytiso pastae distendant ubera vaccae —  
incipere, si quid habes.*

So may your bees shun the Corsican yew trees,  
So may your kine, on clover fed, distend their udders —  
Begin, if you have any [song to sing].

7. And do we always stop to admire and remember to treasure those casually met *sententiae*, those gems of thought, brief, clean cut, and brilliant like any jewel? Caesar's unadorned narrative naturally contains no such epigrammatic sayings; but in Cicero's glowing orations you will recall such passages; Vergil is full of them, and we need not pause to quote them. I suppose the most justly famous and most often quoted of classic *sententiae* is Ovid's line from Medea's rhesis (*Met.* vii, 20):

*Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor.*

I see and approve the better course; the worse I follow.

But Seneca's brilliant rhetoric has coined scores of notable *sententiae*. His tragedies are the home of the epigram. Out of them all I offer just a little group of pronouncements on sin:

*Tro.* 291: *Qui non vetat peccare, cum possit, iubet.*

Who, when he may, forbids not sin, commands it.

870: *Ad auctorem redit sceleris coacti culpa.*

To its author returns the Blame of crime compelled.

*Med.* 500: *Cui prodest scelus, is fecit.*

Who profits by a sin has done the sin.

*Hip.* 598: *Honesta quaedam scelera successus facit.*

Success makes some sins honorable.

*Ag.* 243: *Quem paenitet peccasse paene est innocens.*

Whoso repents his sin is well-nigh innocent.

267: *Det ille veniam facile cui venia est opus.*

Let him forgive freely who forgiveness needs.

\* \* \* \* \*

Yes, translation is an art, a fine art. I should be the last to depreciate it. By all means let our students become proficient in it. But after all, translation is but the key to the house of greater treasures, the fascinating treasures of classic literature. Let us be sure that our students do not fail to enter that house.

These are some few of those "matters over and above" of which I spoke at the beginning; these are *Translation Plus*.

## TREATMENT OF CHARACTER IN EURIPIDES AND SENECA: THE HIPPOLYTUS

By STEN G. FLYGT  
Wesleyan University

Although it is generally accepted that Euripides' dramatic writings do not exhibit the mystic grandeur and universality to be found in the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles, a comparison of a play by Euripides with the corresponding play by Seneca leads to the conclusion that Euripides had not lost the tragic spirit that was Greek. I believe that the basic difference between Euripides' *Hippolytus* and Seneca's play on the same subject lies in a differing conception of the tragic. The tragic spirit of the two men makes itself felt in style, structure, and character portrayal, but it is particularly in the conception of character that it allows itself to be detected and examined. If, then, we compare each of the four main characters in Euripides' *Hippolytus* with the corresponding character in Seneca's *Phaedra*,<sup>1</sup> we may be able to discover and analyze a difference that is fundamental and typical for the two playwrights.

<sup>1</sup> Some inferior manuscripts have the alternative title *Hippolytus*. Martin Schanz (*Geschichte der roemischen Litteratur*, II, ii<sup>3</sup>: Muenchen, Beck [1913], p. 59) considers it clear that Seneca's play is based not upon the present play of Euripides (*Ἰππόλυτος στεφανηφόρος*) but upon an earlier version now lost, entitled *Ἰππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος*: "Er [i.e. Seneca] wird daher an *Ἰππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος* sich angeschlossen haben, wie Ovid in der vierten Heroide, nicht aber an die sophokleische *Phaedra*." Louis Meridier, however, in his edition of the text of Euripides with a French translation (*Euripide*: Paris, Les Belles Lettres [1927], II, 16) maintains the plausibility of an opposite view: "Mais ce ne sont là que des conjectures sur lesquelles il serait imprudent de se fonder. Sénèque a pu avoir d'autres modèles qu' Euripide. Il est de même pour Ovide." And he adds in a footnote, "Il est possible, notamment, qu' il se soit inspiré de la Phèdre de Sophocle." The question can probably not be settled and in this paper will be disregarded, since the purpose is not to show how Seneca altered the material at his disposal, but to indicate differences in feeling and tone between the two writers.

I think there can be no doubt that in Hippolytus Euripides wished to portray a type of genuine devotion to the ideal of chastity. It would be a misconception to believe that Hippolytus' horror of the nurse's proposal is affectation and that his misogyny is a pose concealing lewdness; for the speech of Artemis in the epilogue would alone be sufficient evidence for the sincerity of Hippolytus' feelings, even were this not apparent from his speech and action. But Hippolytus is not a thoroughly attractive character, for he is too conscious of his devotion to his ideals of virtue and of his own perfect chastity. When he offers the wreath to Artemis he cannot refrain from expressing pride and satisfaction in the unique privileges which are his because of his virtue (68-87). When Theseus is reviling him and falsely accusing him, this habit of self-consciousness causes him to wish that he might see himself with his own eyes in order to bewail the sorrows that he is enduring (1078-79). This wish brings from Theseus the just reproach that it is his nature to honor himself more than his parents (1080 f.). Even in the midst of the greatest danger and pain he cannot forget that he is not as other men are; for the messenger reports that while the frightened horses were dragging him along the shore he exclaimed that they were destroying the best of men (1240-42), and with his dying breath he calls Zeus to witness that a man who surpassed all others in purity is about to perish (1363-67). This extreme self-consciousness indicates that he is a fanatical ascetic on the points of sex and honor. He has allowed his ideals to control him to such an extent that he has fallen a prey to them and his mind has become diseased. It is for this reason that he bursts into such violent expressions of horror at the suggestions of the nurse (660 ff.), and it is for this reason that he inveighs so bitterly and blindly against all women (616 ff.). With Euripides' Hippolytus chastity is a mania.

Seneca's Hippolytus is also genuinely chaste, but the roots of his chastity are not diseased as is the case with his prototype. He is far less self-conscious, and his praise of himself is not at all conspicuous. He finds it only natural that he should adhere to the



ideal of chastity, for it has probably never occurred to him to do otherwise. He is a man of much simpler mind with slight habits of meditation. When the nurse makes her dishonorable proposal to him, that he should taste sensual pleasures, his first reaction is to praise the delights of the simple life in nature (483 ff.). He then goes on to say that man's natural goodness has been corrupted by the advance of civilization and that the cause of this is woman. But this is rather the tirade of the inexperienced youth, whose sex-consciousness has not been aroused. It is a fact of common observation that boys often express and feel a hatred and contempt for girls and that the more serious among them go so far as to accuse woman of being the author of all evil. This, I think, is the case of the Roman Hippolytus. Sex-consciousness is still slumbering within him, but it is present; for he flees Phaedra's presence lest she may influence him: *Abscede, vive, ne quid exores* (713). Both the Greek Hippolytus and the Roman Hippolytus are at least unusual, but the Greek is the more complex, since his chastity seems to be a sex-obsession. The Roman Hippolytus, because of protracted infantile misogyny, is simply indifferent: with him other motives are stronger than the sex-motive, for his chief delight is in the physical sensations of hunting. Compared to Euripides' Hippolytus Seneca's character loses heavily in depth of significance, for the former is a study in the abnormal, a study with many implications and deep problems.

In neither play is Theseus of great significance. In the Greek version about all one can say of him is that he is a man of action rather than a man of reflection. He has killed the sons of Pallas and must therefore do penance in exile from Athens (35 ff.). Repentance and reflection follow the deed of violence. In like fashion, when he reads Phaedra's false letter of accusation, without stopping to reflect, to investigate, or to consult the oracles, he calls down upon his son a mortal curse (885 ff.). But Theseus is, in addition, a man of strength and resolution. This strength he shows nowhere so much as in the scene where the cruel death of his son has been reported to him and he has sufficient determina-

tion to express indifference to his loss. One might expect from another, weaker man an outburst of cruel exultation followed by a despairing realization that he has caused the death of his own son. But Theseus can calmly say, and hide a world of feeling, that he will neither rejoice nor grieve at Hippolytus' death (1257-60). He also shows indications of true greatness of soul in that he has the capacity finally to confess his fault and to ask pardon of his dying son (1410).

Just as Seneca's Hippolytus is in some respects modeled upon Euripides' character, so Seneca's Theseus is in a way similar to Euripides' Theseus. The Roman character shows the same trait of acting without due reflection when he invokes the curse before trying to find out how Hippolytus' sword came into the possession of Phaedra (903 ff.). But he is a far baser character. In the Greek play Theseus is absent on a pilgrimage of expiation, but in Seneca's version he has gone to the underworld to ravish Pluto's bride, Proserpina. He seems to be a sort of philanderer who desires to crown his amours by the conquest of a goddess. He lacks the strength which enabled his prototype to dissemble his feelings at the death of his son, but bursts at once into wailful cries of regret (1114-22). He lacks, too, the greatness of soul that enabled the Greek Theseus to pray for pardon, since he is unable to forgive Phaedra but curses her even in death (1279-80).

The nurse in Euripides' play is not important for her own sake but is brought in chiefly to precipitate the action by trying to plead Phaedra's case with Hippolytus. This function once performed, she leaves the action and is not heard of again. But even though she is important rather as a piece of the mechanics of the play than as a study in character, Euripides has endowed her with considerable personality. Her dominant trait is devotion to Phaedra, and to this all other traits are subordinated — a step made necessary by the brief treatment given her. In Phaedra's illness she has been the faithful attendant at the bedside who has done all in her power to assuage her mistress' sufferings. She succeeds by clever questions and reproaches in drawing out Phaedra's

secret and is horrified by the threatened ruin of her mistress' good name. But when she sees that Phaedra is determined to die in order to subdue her guilty passion, she determines to risk everything in order to save her beloved mistress' life. It is for this reason that she makes to Hippolytus the proposal that he finds so infamous (601-14). And it is for her utter devotion that Phaedra rudely dismisses her and bids her be gone about her own affairs (708 f.). And so, her usefulness over, she hobbles off the stage, a lonely and pathetic figure.

Seneca's nurse has traits in common with the nurse of Euripides. In her, too, the dominant trait is devotion to her mistress. She has already had knowledge of Phaedra's love for Hippolytus and at first attempts to dissuade her from the mad project in order to save her good name (129 ff.). But when Phaedra pretends to yield to her persuasion and to threaten suicide, she, too, resolves to gain for Phaedra the love of Hippolytus (267-73). Later, when the young man has violently repulsed his stepmother, the nurse, hoping to save her mistress' reputation even at the expense of Hippolytus' life, suggests that Phaedra be the accuser in order to avoid being the accused (720-35). And she actually forces her not altogether unwilling mistress into a new false position. But it is just at this point that the Roman nurse is essentially different from the Greek. Whereas the *τροφός* gains the reader's sympathy and even his pity, the *nutrix* is entirely lacking — or nearly so — in attractive qualities. We can well sympathize with her efforts to seduce Hippolytus for her mistress, but when she resorts to so base a stratagem as to accuse an innocent man of crime that will be punished by death, we can only regret that she does not share the fate of Phaedra.

But it is perhaps in the conception of Phaedra that the fundamental difference in viewpoint between the two dramatists is most clearly shown. Each of the characters in the Roman tragedy has been only a degraded parallel of the corresponding character in the Greek play; but the transformation suffered by Phaedra at the hands of Seneca reveals a divergent view of life.

I believe it is safe to say that Euripides' heroine is a study of a conflict in character. Phaedra is naturally and normally a woman of unquestionable chastity and self-control. She tells how, when the madness seized her, she made repeated efforts to quell her passion, but to no avail, until she was forced into a resolution to die rather than dishonor herself (392-403). In character she is as chaste — she possesses as great *σωφροσύνη* — as Hippolytus himself; but it is chastity of a different sort. Hippolytus is driven by an obsession; but in Phaedra's usual self there is none of the psychopathic, as is evidenced by her married life with Theseus, which we can only assume to have been normal and happy. To this fundamental chastity is added an overwhelming and guilty passion. Here it must carefully be noted that it is a fated madness brought upon her by the goddess Aphrodite, who uses the woman as a tool in her scheme to destroy Hippolytus (21 f., 47-50). Euripides has portrayed for us the spectacle of a normally pure-minded woman suddenly and unaccountably smitten with forbidden love. This fated passion is so powerful that it can break her control. The madness has been suppressed and checked by her will and reason (271-73), and utterance has not been given to it; but despite suppression or through suppression it has grown so strong that it commences to overthrow her reason. Phaedra raves and utters hints concerning her malady, but an unconsciously exercised check prevents self-betrayal. She recovers her senses, and now, worn out by the dreadful struggles, is attacked by the searching questions of the nurse. At the mention of the name Hippolytus (310), the name that has been resounding in her mind until it has driven her frantic, she gives an involuntary start. The opening once made, her pent-up feelings begin to break through, at first gradually and then with force increasing to violence. Her natural reason and will have been exhausted by the long effort; they can no longer maintain concealment of her secret. Her fated madness has so far prevailed over her that she faintly hopes — at the same time that she fears — that the nurse will intervene successfully. But once the declaration has been

made to Hippolytus and once he has repulsed her, sanity returns and the madness nearly vanishes. There is now no possibility for the woman of chaste soul to live on with this blot upon her. Death is the only course possible and herein does chastity triumph. But her fatal madness also celebrates a triumph, for her violent love has been transformed into as violent a desire to ruin Hippolytus (723-731). The power of the Cyprian works through death.

Whereas Euripides portrays a good woman who is ruined by circumstances over which she has no control, Seneca portrays a woman whose lust brings destruction upon others and finally upon herself. We have seen that the Greek Phaedra is a study of conflict in character; the Roman Phaedra is a study in baseness. Evidence that she is possessed of a consuming lust can be found in the circumstance that she has already confessed to the nurse her desire for Hippolytus (171-73). Then, too, when the nurse offers arguments against the passion, setting forth the impossibility of satisfying it and the dangers attendant upon it, Phaedra offers counter-arguments, until suddenly she appears to submit and threatens suicide. This device to gain the aid of the nurse has its desired effect, for the nurse counsels disgrace rather than death and proceeds to urge Hippolytus to learn of sensual joys (432-85). But one must observe that it is not the nurse who makes the proposal of incest to Hippolytus. After she has been urging upon him a less austere life, Phaedra appears and resorts to another stratagem. She faints in Hippolytus' arms (585). Then, when she has recovered, it is she herself who makes the proposal which the horrified Hippolytus rejects, although he confesses that Phaedra's words may have some power over him (704-14).<sup>2</sup>

Further indication of Phaedra's baseness is to be found in her at least half-willing coöperation with the nurse in her plan to destroy Hippolytus (868-902), for it must be remembered that

<sup>2</sup> These words are her plea to be killed, another device; compare the Duke of Gloucester's offering his bared bosom to Lady Anne in Shakespeare's *Richard III*. But the confession that any words of Phaedra might be able to influence him show that Hippolytus' feelings do not consist of unmixed loathing.



there is nothing in Seneca's play to indicate that Phaedra's actions are fated.<sup>8</sup> There are, in fact, indications to the contrary, for the nurse rebukes Phaedra, saying that her passion is a culpable and wilful lust, and that lust has been given the name of deity to sanction license:

*Deum esse amorem turpis et vitio furens  
finxit libido, quoque liberior foret  
titulum furori numinis falsi addidit* (195-97).

Like her prototype, Phaedra commits suicide. But one must observe that the revelation of her shameful passion is not enough to drive her to this step, for she does not stab herself until after she knows that Hippolytus has been dragged to death. Then in a sort of wild and despairing repentance that she has caused the death of Hippolytus, the man whom she loved, frustrated in the hope of satisfying her passion after his death, she plunges the knife into her body, crying that she will follow him through Tartarus (1179-84). Her lust pursues him even beyond the grave.

It might be said that Euripides' play violates the unity of character by a shift in interest from Phaedra to Hippolytus and that Seneca's play, since interest is patently centered in Phaedra, exhibits a closer adherence to this unity. But I believe that the foregoing character analysis will help to show that the apparent shift in interest in Euripides' play was made necessary by the author's conception of the characters, and that it is therefore indicative of artistry in maintaining the unity of Phaedra as a consistent character. In his play Euripides is interested equally in Phaedra and in Hippolytus as contrasting in their attitudes toward sex. They exhibit different types of sex-madness: Hippolytus, fanatical chastity, and Phaedra, overwhelming passion. If they did not have opposite attitudes toward the same question, no tragedy would be possible. But it must be admitted that, of the two characters,

<sup>8</sup> Such a passage as the conclusion of Phaedra's speech (112-128) alluding to the "fated malady" (*Fatale miserae matris agnosco malum*) is to be viewed as Phaedra's attempt to excuse herself and not as an indication of the true cause of her passion. Besides, these references to fate afflicting various members of Phaedra's line savor richly of literary convention.



Phaedra is the more interesting to us, since she is the more complex. Two forces struggle within her soul; Hippolytus is dominated by a single obsession. Now I think it can be said that, since Euripides' interest in the two characters seems to have been about equal, there is no real violation of the unity of character, even though Phaedra physically leaves the action early in the play; for they represent conflicting aspects of the same problem. From the point of view of plot Hippolytus is the main character, since the play is concerned with the exposition of how Aphrodite takes vengeance upon him, and Phaedra is only the tool of the goddess. But from the viewpoint of character, the man and the woman are of equal importance. The development of interest in these characters follows a peculiar path. Hippolytus, offering a garland to Artemis (73 ff.) and ignoring the goddess of love, is introduced as the object of Aphrodite's wrath. But interest is then concentrated upon Phaedra as the means of Hippolytus' downfall and as a fresh and different aspect of the sex problem. It is a brilliant study in a short space. But for reasons of consistency in character it becomes necessary that Phaedra be removed from the stage. Smitten by a fatal and fated passion, Phaedra, by nature as chaste as Hippolytus himself, cannot remain alive after the revelation of her secret. To live is for her a moral impossibility. That is, she cannot continue to live and be the same Phaedra. But although she cannot live, her very death directs the course of the subsequent action. The dead Phaedra is as much the tool of Aphrodite as the living Phaedra, and if our criterion of reality is the ability to produce effects, the dead Phaedra is just as real to Euripides as ever was the living Phaedra. It is Phaedra's death, the very event that causes the apparent shift in interest, that maintains the unity of character and the unity of action.

In general, Seneca has very largely taken the play out of the realm of the mystic and exalted. He shows a shift toward realism in the treatment of his characters, but he does not display great skill in subtle psychological analysis. There are, to be sure, shrewd strokes of penetration, as when Phaedra faints in Hippolytus' arms; but they are rather broad and obvious. I think it may be

said that, although Seneca's characters approximate realistic standards in portraying more common types of people from daily life, they give an impression of shallowness. They are individuals, lacking in significance beyond themselves. Seneca's world is one of free will, moral responsibility, and guilt. The men and women in it, through flaws of character and lack of self-control, directly involve themselves and others in the consequences of their transgressions. Euripides' world, in the *Hippolytus*, is one where guilt and moral responsibility do not *really* exist, because man's life is not in his own control. Things happen to human beings that are out of all proportion to their deserts, and humanity is at the mercy of whatever forces control the universe. Their desires, their efforts, their merits are of no significance in the cosmic scheme. This is what Euripides seems to be saying in this play, for his characters are not so much individuals as universals, sublimated types of helpless, suffering humanity. Nietzsche says somewhere that in Greek tragedy the actions of the characters have a more profound significance than their speeches. A modern reader is perhaps disappointed not to find in the *Hippolytus* the refined and subtle analysis of psychological complexities to which he has grown accustomed. But let him try to probe to the bottom Phaedra or Hippolytus and he will discover that behind their rather simple outlines is a sea of meaning that is deep as Mimir's well, at the bottom of which lies Odin's eye, given in exchange for one draught of those waters of wisdom.

## ERASMUS' GREEK STUDIES

By RACHEL GIESE  
Madison, Wis.

When Erasmus first visited England, in the year 1499, it seemed to him he had found everything which could make life sweet, pleasant skies and wholesome air and friends with whom he would be glad to live "even in farthest Scythia." In Colet he seemed to behold another Plato, in Grocyn the embodiment of all science, in Linacre a mind incomparably keen and lofty, in Thomas More the gentlest and most amiable temper ever framed by nature. Not Italy itself, that land of his dreams where he expected the very walls to discourse more wisely than the men of less favored climes, seemed to promise him anything finer than the English scholarship, so exquisite and profound, of the true ancient stamp, both Greek and Latin. Why then, we may ask, did he not accept the invitation which he received from Colet to remain and lecture at Oxford? Probably because he could not; perhaps because he would not. For notwithstanding his high estimate of English learning, it would seem that he could find no one at Oxford to teach him Greek, and to learn Greek was now his sole ambition.<sup>1</sup>

As a boy, at the famous school of Deventer, he had been able to acquire only the first elements of the language, and even during his first years of independent study in Paris he made little further progress, but his enthusiasm had only grown with his sense of the difficulties to be conquered. He was as keenly aware as any of the Italian humanists, his masters, that Greek was the most essential part of the new learning and the most invidious in the sight of conservative divines. It was the language of pagan

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. S. Allen, *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*: Oxford, The Clarendon Press (1906 ff.), Vol. I, App. VI, p. 592.

poets and heretical theologians, a language long lost and laboriously recovered, preserving the most ancient traditions of both classic and Christian thought and offering authentic solutions for all the problems of religion and science. It was accordingly with wonder and delight, with militant ardor, and with a touch of prophetic awe that Erasmus at last addressed himself to this master study. He might have feared that he was already somewhat old for so arduous an undertaking, but Cato the Censor learned Greek at eighty, and the sense of his own tardiness served only to intensify his resolution.

Without any of the familiar aids of the modern student, without a compendious grammar, standard texts, or a serviceable lexicon, without a teacher and without fellow-students, he set to work and in five or six years achieved a full and fluent command of the language. His exact course of study is not easy to trace, for his ambition outran even his powers of acquisition while his later learning sometimes took a retrospective turn and supplied Greek quotations for writings composed when he presumably read no Greek. But his mighty effort and impetuous advance are fully recorded in the correspondence of these years and give a lively sense of Erasmus' temper and habits of mind. The study of Greek has become the center of his life. After his return from England to Paris he fairly abandons Latin in its favor and even has reason to fear that he may lose all skill in the latter tongue. He is driven from Paris by the plague, but he feels that he must return in order to proceed with his chosen study. He finds a teacher there in Hermonymus of Sparta, the master of Reuchlin and Budaeus, but like them he speedily discovers that this Greekling neither could teach anything if he would nor would teach if he could. He borrows a copy of Homer, and although he cannot yet read it, he takes such delight in its mere aspect that he can scarcely bring himself to return it to the impatient owner. He promises eternal gratitude to anyone who will send him books or manuscripts, and when he is so fortunate as to obtain any he spends his days and nights in copying them, regardless of his health and worldly interests. If he has a little money, he buys

first Greek books and then clothes. If he has none, he would sooner pawn his clothes than forego any new books. His patrons and friends are all enlisted in the service of his passion, the former being called on to ensure his leisure, the latter to share his studies. If they deceive his expectations, he fumes, he frets, but he does not abate his missionary ardor. He fondly invokes the authority of the Council of Vienne, which two hundred years before had vainly decreed the teaching of the principal Oriental tongues in the European universities. Almost before he is himself familiar with the language, he uses it to impress correspondents who are altogether unfamiliar with it, and throughout his life he affects Greek phrases to conceal from the vulgar and commend to the learned his most precious thoughts and secret counsels. When in later years he is reproached with this large infusion of Greek in all his writings, he pleads in extenuation not only the authority of the ancients and the unique grace and appositeness of the Greek tongue but the desire to impress all readers with the need of learning it. He may be a little troubled at the apparent exclusiveness of his position, but for no consideration will he relax his exacting standard:

I do not deny that charity must sometimes stoop to the needs of simple minds, but this is not the time to inquire how far they should be humored. Let them always strive after better things.<sup>2</sup>

This may seem like an excess of zeal, but it barely expresses Erasmus' exalted sense of the value of Greek studies. They are as indispensable to the physician as to the theologian. As they decayed, all learning fell away; and as they revive, all learning should enjoy new bloom. Without Greek the profoundest Latin erudition is but a lame and halting matter:

We have but shallow streams of learning and standing pools; they have springing fountains and rivers charged with gold.<sup>3</sup>

That was Erasmus' assured conviction, from the very beginning of his studies, and it was in the fulness of this belief that he de-

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, Ep. 1147.60.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, Ep. 149.19.

voted his life to retracing and expounding the wisdom of the Greeks, in classical and Christian times, and to harmonizing it with the accepted Latin tradition. As early as 1502 he could declare that his concentration on Greek had not been fruitless for he could now write anything he wished *ex-tempore*. By 1504 he could assure Colet that in the pleasant garden of Greek poetry he was gathering a store of knowledge which would enrich even his studies of theology. In 1506 he could remark that although there is no end to learning, yet he had at last enough Greek to address himself to those graver studies which should fill his remaining years and prepare his mind for death.

All this would seem to prove not only the fervor with which Erasmus pursued his arduous course of study, but also the lofty aims which from the first inspired him. And it is this earnestness of ulterior purpose which gives an especial piquancy to the translations which he made during these years from various authors, but chiefly from Euripides and Lucian. He never professed to attach much value to these casual performances, but the motives that inspired him are both apposite and revealing. He wished to supply the want of a tutor by these careful exercises which afforded him an incomparable initiation into the niceties of the two languages. He wished to try his unformed talents on these profane and trifling themes before essaying to interpret the sacred texts of primitive Christianity. He hoped to gain the favor of numerous patrons by the dedication of these brief pieces whose varied matter could be chosen to flatter every taste and aptitude. He hoped to excite the emulation of fellow scholars by showing how much could be done in this field. He was rather pleased than grieved to think that the spread of Greek studies would soon divert his readers from these translations to their originals. But meanwhile he was himself persuaded, and he expended all his eloquence to persuade others, that whether couched in Greek or Latin these apparently frivolous exercises were full of edification for the modern world.

A translation of the *Odyssey* which Erasmus is reported to have made has not survived, but his version of some declamations



on Homeric themes by the Attic rhetorician Libanius shows how much store he set on the least gleanings from these ancient fields. His translations of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*, published in 1506, are notable for their careful versification; but quite as much by their defects as by their merits they justify Erasmus' frequent protestations that nothing is harder than to turn good Greek into good Latin. Each play apparently cost several months' work, not a little of which must have been given to the interpretation and emendation of the original text. The *Hecuba* was rendered with literal accuracy, the *Iphigenia* with considerable freedom; but in both versions the style is more labored than felicitous. Erasmus as much admired the sober elegance of Euripides, his subtle concision and keen argument, as he mistrusted the grandiloquence of Latin tragedy with its fustian and bombast; but his expression is as devoid of Euripides' penetrating sweetness as of Seneca's artificial splendor. It is throughout singularly dry and harsh, with few of the qualities of good prose and almost none of the special charm of poetry. The movement of the verse is generally easy and rapid, but rarely powerful or suggestive. The diction, though never inspired, is at any rate wonderfully copious. On the whole, it is not in the expression of dramatic emotion that Erasmus is most nearly adequate, but in philosophic expatiation and epigrammatic sentences. He loved the leisurely commonplaces of ancient poetry, and those very *gnomae* which least commend Euripides to the modern reader seem to him worthy of the most reverential rendering. It is characteristic of Erasmus' ingenuity and patience that he should have achieved such comparative excellence both in these rhetorical maxims and in the treatment of monostichs, which though dramatic in intention are in effect purely rhetorical. He excels in the artificial, not because he prefers it to simple nature but because his powers of expression so far outrun his imagination. He can triumph only by triumphing over arbitrary difficulties. He is not at all a poet, but he is an amazing virtuoso. And this is why his most astonishing feat is precisely the translation of the choruses whose beauty he scarcely felt but whose metrical complication

was a supreme challenge to his skill. His remarks on this topic are extremely curious, and though a worthy French critic has found them almost too impious to transcribe, we may discover in them the measure of Erasmus' poetic sensibility, of his critical independence, and of his technical virtuosity. From the first he was shocked by the wanton obscurity of the choruses and their affected strangeness, while he ended by questioning here even the propriety of the verse whose immoderate license seemed to him to differ little from mere prose. Accordingly, although he gave in the *Hecuba* amazing proof of his metrical skill by the almost exact reproduction of some of the choruses, he preferred in the *Iphigenia* to temper a little this excessive variety of meter, while he even made bold to declare that if ever he found leisure to attempt further versions of the ancient plays, he would alter both form and matter and substitute for all this canorous nonsense some graceful theme soberly developed:

For nowhere does antiquity seem to me to have been more inept than in such choruses, whose style is vitiated by an excessive affectation of novelty while the sense is sacrificed to verbal miracle-mongering.<sup>4</sup>

On the whole it may seem as if these translations, which were so soon forgotten and are not now read at all, had been a sad waste of time and talent. Nor can it be denied that this entire neglect is well deserved, for even among the Latin plays of the Renaissance there are many that preserve a far more vital charm. Yet as the faded memorials of an enthusiasm once supremely potent, they still appeal to the willing imagination; at least they serve to recall the enchanted hour which gave them birth and the mood of creative retrospection which inspired them. For they were the first versions that had yet been attempted from the Greek tragic poets, and so record not merely the beginning of that return to ancient models which determined the evolution of the modern drama, but the culmination also of that larger reversion to Greek sources which marks the Renaissance as the legitimate heir of that Latin culture which also sought its inspiration in the poetry and

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, Ep. 208.25.

philosophy of Greece. There is little enough of the poet in Erasmus, and to compare him even to an Accius or a Pacuvius would be to do him an injurious honor, but his endeavor at least and his inspiring purpose were not unworthy of talents far greater than his own.

It is, however, always a relief to turn from Erasmus' verse to his prose, and it is an especial pleasure to pass from his versions of Euripides to those of Lucian. For while into the former he could put only the least part of his talent, into the latter he put the best part of his philosophy as well as his subtlest touches of literary skill. Lucian was a general favorite with the early humanists and there were few of them who had not at some time amused themselves by translating a dialogue or two, but none ever brought to the interpretation of the ancient satirist a more feeling admiration than Erasmus. There is scarcely an aspect of Lucian's varied genius that is not represented in the score of pieces which Erasmus chose, somewhat at haphazard, for presentation to his friends as New Year's gifts or pleasant reminders of scholarly fellowship. Nor is there a plausible argument in apology or praise of Lucian's discursive wit which Erasmus has not developed in his prefaces. He sees in Lucian an incomparable champion of that cause which he was himself never tired of defending, the cause of good sense and sound feeling in life and literature. It is the very lightness of Lucian's tone, his apparent heedlessness and gay inconsequence, that most delight Erasmus and most edify him. In this indefinable fusion of grave and gay, this subtle transposition of the most controversial themes into the persuasive dialect of humor, he saw the operation of a mind too intent upon the truth to idle among its own happy fancies, yet too serenely self-possessed ever to forget them in the heat of battle. In short, he saw in Lucian the most precious qualities of his own mind and honored them accordingly. It might be questioned whether his conception of Lucian has not too much of this flattering self-portraiture to be altogether a good likeness, but it is only the more interesting to students of Erasmus for this subtle deflection.

And whatever the degree of kinship between the two satirists, there was an even more striking resemblance between Lucian's victims and Erasmus' enemies. To translate Lucian might be not only a graceful literary exercise but a strategic attack upon the embattled forces of reactionary orthodoxy. This modern bearing of his ancient themes is ever present to Erasmus' mind, and he does not fail to point the moral in his prefaces. He admires in Lucian the free speech of the old comedy without its licentious excess; he protests that if ever any one has satisfied the Horatian demand for charm and edification it is this laughing enemy of philosophic pride and hypocritic virtue; he sees a service to true piety in this delicate mockery of wrangling sophists, and in this neat unmasking of miracle-mongering magicians he sees a warning against modern impostors of the same breed. He cannot deny that some of Lucian's divagations are too trifling to bear any philosophic interpretation, but Lucian's incalculable humor and vagrant imagination have for him an irresistible charm. He still sees a larger meaning in his most irresponsible paradoxes and lends himself whole-heartedly to his most daring flights of fancy. All the folly of earth and heaven is passed in review and the best remedy is found to lie not in idle speculations on the courses of the sun and moon nor in sour definitions of the whole duty of man, but in the gay extravagance of the Saturnalia when for a few short winter days Jove abdicates his iron rule, and masters and slaves, rich and poor, feast together as when the world was young.

Such were the pleasant fancies which Erasmus found in Lucian and commended to his readers as trifles, indeed, but literary trifles, inspiring a meditative laughter; well-seasoned jests, as profitable as they are merry; ingenious inventions that are to be reckoned among the compositions that form manners and shape conduct. It would seem evident that Erasmus himself, taking such pleasure in the study of Lucian and expending so much eloquence in his praise, could not remain untouched by his influence. Nothing would appear to be easier than to estimate the Lucianic element in Erasmus' later writings and to compute his direct bor-

rowings from his ancient model. But as a matter of fact nothing is more impossible.<sup>5</sup> In the *Praise of Folly*, in the *Colloquies*, and even in Erasmus' gravest theological writings, there are innumerable touches that to him as to us must have recalled Lucian's deft and penetrating manner. There is even in Erasmus' philosophy of life a smiling detachment, a gentle scorn for confessed folly and professed sapience which seem to mark him as one of the fellowship of skeptical moralists who from Lucian to Montaigne have been refining on the wisdom of Solomon. But this scorn is only apparent, and this detachment is founded not on disillusion but on faith, a faith more subtle than any skepticism and far more serene. It is a faith that shuns definition and delights in Protean disguises, but it is to be felt no less in Erasmus' secular than in his religious thought. It saves him from that misanthropy which is the final residuum even of Montaigne's skepticism, and which is the antinomy of true humanism. It affords him a vantage-ground, inaccessible to the complete skeptic, from which to view the shifting scenes of human life in relation to some larger whole. It allows him to perceive not only the play of illusion, which is the stuff of all experience, but an enduring law behind the shows of sense which gives to experience a form and meaning. In short, it supplies him with a moral standard by which to appraise the erratic comedy whose finest humor, as well as its deeper meaning, must ever escape the merely curious observer.

As Erasmus could not bring himself to number Lucian among the sophists, he felt compelled to attribute to him also something of this ultimate seriousness which he considered indispensable to a great satirist. But this is in itself almost enough to prove that Lucian's influence, however fruitful, was never sovereign. On the whole, it would seem as if it served rather to enrich and deepen the native vein of humor that is already present in Erasmus' earliest writings than to awaken in him any new powers. It is certainly by the gift of humorous observation that Erasmus is

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Martha Heep, "Die Colloquia Familiaria des Erasmus und Lucian," *Hermes* XVIII (1927), 61-72.



most closely akin to Lucian, and by the free play of fancy which distinguishes humor from pure wit even when it is not touched by that warmer flow of sentiment which in recent years we have been apt to consider the chief distinction between them.

To conclude, it is evident that his acquisition of Greek was for Erasmus the most momentous experience of that formative period which lasted almost till his fortieth year. For he saw from the first to what use he would put his hard-won knowledge. His first visit to England has justly been taken as the turning-point in his development, when he passed from the casual and belletristic humanism of his student years to the larger purposes of his maturity. These larger aims involved nothing less than the simplification of Christian dogma — or as Erasmus put it, the restoration of primitive Christianity — and the reconciliation of Christian and classical antiquity. In the first of these undertakings he was undoubtedly much influenced by Colet; but with a sureness of instinct that was peculiarly his own, he saw that to accomplish his purpose he must make himself master of the "sacred tongues." Accordingly, he delayed his biblical and patristic studies for several years, while he solaced himself with the profane conversation of a scoffer like Lucian. To many of his contemporaries this was as unpardonable as it was incomprehensible, but for us it is the measure of that literary sensibility and ethical imagination which still impart to Erasmus' words a familiar — and authoritative — accent. In short, if Erasmus still seems a modern among the moderns, versed in all the baffling subtleties of contemporary thought, it is precisely because he devoted himself so wholeheartedly to the study of antiquity, Greek as well as Latin. And if the influence even of his greatest favorites among the ancient authors is not to be traced in parallel passages and obvious references, it is precisely because he dealt with them so freely and sympathetically, as one of the same family.



## ONE TEACHER OF CLASSICS

By MARY E. MAIR  
Plainfield, N. J.

In no fewer than 75 liberal arts colleges in 30 of these United States, one teacher has sole responsibility for the Classics! Examination of 190 catalogs disclosed 115 colleges with two or more teachers of classics and these 75 colleges with but one. Of the 75, 77 per cent are coeducational; 20 per cent are women's colleges; and not quite 3 per cent are colleges for men. Of their Classics teachers, two were unnamed in the catalogs; 43 were men; 30 were women; over 28 per cent of these teachers hold the doctor's degree; over 60 per cent have the master's; over 10 per cent hold no higher degree than the bachelor's. The graduate schools where they have studied include 40 different institutions, most of them mentioned but once. The centrally located University of Chicago, however, is mentioned 14 times.

Most of these one-man departments of classics offer courses in "high-school Latin," either in whole or in part. Greek, beginning with the elements, is offered in 60 of the 75 catalogs. Some of these colleges require Latin or Greek as a sort of password to the baccalaureate degree. Sometimes it is required of freshmen, if mathematics is not taken. However, by far the greater number of these 75 colleges offer the Classics only as electives. In 48 of their catalogs appear major requirements widely varying as to number of semester hours and as to course specifications. For instance, while some colleges credit toward the major any Classics course pursued in college, others exclude "high-school Latin" or "freshman required Latin" or count no major without certain prescribed courses. Some require Greek with Latin as a supporting minor, or vice versa; others allow Greek to be counted toward a Latin major.

Of major requirements mentioned in 48 catalogs, the number of semester-hours ranges from 18 to 30, and the average is a bit more than the 24 that 30 of these colleges require. Of minor requirements mentioned in 34 catalogs, the number of semester hours ranges from 12, which 14 of these colleges require, to 20, with the average requirement about 15.

Questionnaire cards bearing information about schedules, rotation of courses, and bases for their choice were returned by 41 of the 75 lonely teachers. Replies regarding amount of work done in other departments could not be compared with any degree of accuracy, because some teachers taught archaeology, history of Greece and Rome, ancient art, or Greek and Latin literature in translation and classed such subjects as Greek or Latin, or at least as of that ilk, while others classed them as history, English, and the like. When these classics teachers do not have both Latin and Greek, they usually have Latin and some other language or perhaps philosophy to teach, or the duties of a dean, registrar, or even those of a college band leader to perform! The 41 reported schedules, all told, whether or not strictly classical, bear hours ranging in number from 6 to 40. The average is between 16 and 17. In twelve cases, 15 is the number of schedule hours.

Among 38 teachers reporting, the number of hours spent on Latin weekly ranges from 3 to 19, seven of these teachers having 6, and the average approximating 10. The Greek schedules of 25 reporting teachers range from 3 to 13, eight teachers having 3 hours each, and the average number of hours exceeding 5. Likewise, the combined classics average would be between 9 and 10 hours of Latin and between 5 and 6 of Greek, although the greater number of teachers reporting have 6 hours of Latin and 3 of Greek and often 6 or more of some other subject.

Student-hours weekly reported by 38 teachers range from 14 to 255, thirteen teachers having fewer than 50 each, fourteen having less than 100, though more than 50, and the average reaching over 85. The overburdened professor with 255 student-hours has 15 of Latin, 9 of Greek, and 2 of something else, with 20 students specializing in his department!

Many factors influence choice of courses. According to their own reports, 41 lonely classics teachers in the main are free in choice of subject-matter. A few write that president or dean or faculty committee advises as to courses. Where they offer "high-school Latin" it must meet accrediting agency standards. Some follow courses of institutions which they have attended. One admits modeling her courses on the undergraduate offerings of the state university where her students are most likely to take up graduate work. Many closely approximate the curricula of colleges of similar standing, location, or size. Practically all these 41 teachers state that they ascertain students' needs, preferences, and hopes for the future and plan accordingly. Many teachers are obliged to offer Latin courses for large classes of students who never intend to complete even minor requirements. Many also are asked to teach other subjects or to perform more or less irrelevant duties, so that the building of a schedule becomes more difficult than the putting together of a jig-saw puzzle! One professor states that he follows the advice of the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* as to choice of courses. Another says that he chooses his courses "to include representative authors, to give a thorough foundation and background, and to furnish an interesting selection." There are two general trends, first, one toward the study of certain favorite authors, and second, one toward the study of a variety of types of literature.

The composite offerings listed under Greek in 60 catalogs include 59 different titles, 19 of which are names of Greek authors. Courses oftenest listed are given below, the numbers in parentheses indicating frequency of mention: Elementary Greek (57), Xenophon (40), Homer (39), New Testament Greek (35), Plato (30), Greek Literature in English (21), Greek Drama (19), Euripides (18), Herodotus (15), Sophocles (14), Greek History or Civilization (14), Greek Biography (13), Lysias (12), Aeschylus (9), Demosthenes (9), Thucydides (9).

The composite offerings listed under Latin in 75 catalogs include 31 different authors and 66 other titles. Following are the favorite courses with numbers indicating the frequency of catalog

listing: Horace (65), Cicero (64), Latin Prose Composition (59), Vergil (56), Livy (54), Terence (51), Plautus (44), Tacitus (43), Ovid (40), Pliny (39), Elementary Latin (35), Teaching of Latin (34), Juvenal (32), Catullus (31), Caesar (27), Roman Private Life (26), Latin Drama (23), Martial (21), Lucretius (20), Mythology (20), Seneca (16), Tibullus (14), Propertius (13), Sallust (11).

Information about methods of rotation of courses came in from 33 of these one-man departments of classics. In all, they reported seven different arrangements. Thirteen report using the 1-2 system, repeating some courses yearly, others every two years. Nine report using the 1-2-3 scheme. Five report using the 1-2-3-4 plan. Two give courses only once in two years. Two use the 1-3 scheme, giving some courses every year and some every three years. Two say that they repeat all courses every year, although, for instance, they probably change the content of what they call the yearly Freshman Latin courses. One teacher reports giving courses in a four-year cycle only. Letters received from several teachers indicate more variety in actuality than is reported in catalogs, and also show that a four-year curriculum as detailed in a catalog is merely tentative, adapted at will to suit teacher and students.

Eight professors were so kind as to contribute information about methods they have found effective in handling their one-man departments. A teacher on half-pay offers almost as many courses as he has students. He has succeeded in using one class period for Latin and Greek when two students wanted Latin and one of them also desired Greek. To oblige students with varying amounts of schedule time, he offers a course in the works of one author which individuals may attend from two to four hours a week, receiving credit of corresponding amount based on attendance and the amount of translation accomplished.

Another teacher offers to students untrained in the classics a course in Mythology and Ancient Civilization. For those who had but three years of Latin in high school she gives a course in the *Aeneid*, while for those already initiate therein she offers

Livy and Horace. The students who continue with Latin for three more years use during that time two textbooks, one, *Latin Poets*, published by the Harvard University Press, the other, *Latin Prose Literature*, by Little, Brown. In addition to their Latin reading, her seniors spend some time on Latin Prose Composition and Methods of Teaching Latin.

A third teacher, recognizing the fact that since students completed two or three years of Latin in high school some time may have intervened, gives annually a four-hour course beginning with a review of the forms. The rest of the semester they read Nepos, continue with review of grammar rules, and apply them in prose composition. Although he conducts every year or two a class in advanced prose composition followed by a semester in Methods of Teaching Latin, he has just one other Latin course each year whose content ranges from Terence, Plautus, Cicero, Livy, Horace, Pliny, and Martial to Juvenal. Into this class he puts all students who have had four or more years of Latin and exacts from them amounts of work varying with their stages of advancement. He has each year a four-hour course in elementary Greek and he offers second-year Greek when requested, giving the class the number of hours desired, usually two. To make up the schedule of 16 hours which his college requires as the maximum allowed by the accrediting agency, he chooses from the following two-hour courses: Greek History; Roman History; Ancient Art; and Ancient Civilization. His college has a major requirement of from 24 to 28 hours, with a supporting minor of from 12 to 16 hours.

An enthusiastic professor whose college requires a major of 26 hours, a supporting minor, and another minor, each of 15, really demands of his students a 17-hour minor in Greek. He does not mention providing for those with inadequate high-school preparation in Latin. Each semester he offers a three-hour reading course from those numbered 23-30, presenting one or two of the following authors: Cicero, Sallust, Vergil, Horace, Pliny, Tacitus, Plautus, Terence, Catullus, Ovid, and Livy. He takes Horace, e.g., when no student has read him; Ovid when he is the only

easy author unfamiliar to all the class. He tries to make the first semester the easier of the two and both as different as possible. Freshmen and sophomores are admitted in the first semester, but juniors not until the second, unless there is necessity. Good quality of work is demanded of the freshmen, but the requirement of quantity is more lenient. Two courses required of juniors and seniors in History of Latin Literature and Teaching of Latin and Prose Composition are given alternately. Important authors not included in the three-hour reading courses are stressed particularly during the survey of Latin Literature. He prepares his students in Greek to read more than Xenophon by using Allen's *First Year of Greek*. Students completing this text take two or three more years of Greek, having each year some prose, some Homer, and some tragedy. The teacher chooses at will from these authors: Plato, Euripides, Homer, Thucydides, Aeschylus, and Herodotus. By using vocabulary editions his students have time to do more reading. One student who took four years of Latin and two of Greek with him under this system won a Radcliffe graduate scholarship in classics for one year and in midyear examinations which she took ahead of time for practice received no grade lower than B.

I hold no brief for all the authors or for the order in which they are presented, but I do believe that this investigation has given a picture of actual conditions in one-man departments of classics and has shown what can be done *magna cum laude*, under the circumstances.



## Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent directly to Roy C. Flickinger, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.]

### THOMAS HARDY'S "AESCHYLEAN PHRASE"

No words that Hardy wrote in all his eighty-eight years evoked as much discussion and comment as his "Aeschylean phrase" in what has been called "the most dreadful sentence in modern English literature":<sup>1</sup> "The President of the Immortals had ended his sport with Tess."

Mrs. Hardy has informed us: "The first five words were, as Hardy often explained to his reviewers, but a literal translation of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* 169."<sup>2</sup> It has been assumed from these words that Hardy was making his own translation of μάκρων πρύτανις in Aeschylus. Percy Hutchinson, e.g., in commenting on Hardy's "Greek phrase," remarks: "The novelist had but made a literal translation here of a phrase in the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus."<sup>3</sup>

An examination of English translations of Aeschylus will at first seem to support the belief that Hardy created his own version. Copies of translations made in the eighteenth century were, of course, not likely to be easily available in a town like Dorchester during Hardy's youth. But just seven years before his birth Elizabeth Barrett (afterwards Mrs. Browning) had published her famous translation of *Prometheus*. In this version of 1833, verse 169 reads, "that monarch of the blessed seed."<sup>4</sup> Hardy's writings

<sup>1</sup> P. T. Forsyth, "The Pessimism of Mr. Thomas Hardy," *London Quart. Rev.*, reprinted in *Living Age* cclxxv (1912), 459.

<sup>2</sup> F. E. Hardy, *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy*: New York, Macmillan Co. (1930), 3 f.

<sup>3</sup> "When Hardy Forsook Fiction for Poetry," *New York Times* for May 11, 1930, iv, 5, 1.

<sup>4</sup> E. B. Browning, *Poetical Works*: New York, Jas. Miller (1879), I, 113.

show no familiarity with this phrase. Still farther removed from Hardy's interest is the very idea of "the blessed seed" — a view supported, however, in a translation published eight years after *Tess* had made the Aeschylean phrase notorious. For Paul Elmer More rendered it, "this Lord of the blessed."<sup>5</sup>

When Hardy was a youngster just starting to school, another translation of Aeschylus appeared, from the pen of Professor John Stuart Blackie, in his day called Scotland's greatest Greek scholar. Hardy, as a young man of twenty, spent several hours daily in translating Greek; and it would have seemed likely that Blackie's translation of 1850 would have come into his hands. But if it did, there is no trace of it in *Tess*. The Scottish scholar rendered the phrase in *Prometheus*, "this haughty Lord of Heaven."<sup>6</sup>

In the late eighteen-seventies, when Hardy was applying himself to the task of learning the art of novel-writing, A. O. Prickard of New College, Oxford, edited Aeschylus. In his notes on *Prometheus* verse 169 is translated, "The prince of the gods."<sup>7</sup> This edition may have come to Hardy's attention. If so, it was apparently more to his fancy than were previous versions. For just eight years later Hardy published these words: "Eustacia . . . laid the fault upon . . . some indistinct colossal Prince of the World."<sup>8</sup>

During the next decade Hardy produced two famous novels and while he was at work upon the second of them, Robert Potter published another version of Aeschylus in which the phrase in question was expanded into, "He that o'er the gods holds his despotic reign."<sup>9</sup> The novelist gives us no indication of his having studied Potter's translation; and if he did examine it, not much time elapsed before another competing version appeared. In 1890, while Hardy was writing the last revised pages of *Tess*, Lewis Campbell, professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews, added his

<sup>5</sup> P. E. More, *The Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus*: Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co. (1899), 59.

<sup>6</sup> J. S. Blackie, *The Lyrical Dramas of Aeschylus. Translated into English Verse*: London, J. M. Dent and Co. (1906), 187.

<sup>7</sup> A. O. Prickard, *Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound*<sup>2</sup>: Oxford, University Press (1886), 49.

<sup>8</sup> *The Return of the Native*: New York, Harper and Bros. (1922), 353.

<sup>9</sup> R. Potter, *The Plays of Aeschylus*: London, Routledge (1886), 15.

version of *Prometheus* to the list. But Hardy ignored Campbell's rendition of the Greek. His phrase reads: "Heaven's potentate."<sup>10</sup>

The reader might be quite ready to credit Hardy with having made his own translation; but in spite of all this negative testimony it seems impossible to attribute the phraseology in *Tess* to the novelist, for his exact words are to be found in a translation published in 1849 (Hardy was then nine) by Theodore Alois Buckley, who in his Preface promised his readers "a close and literal version." His translation of verse 169 reads: "In truth hereafter the president of the immortals shall have need of me."<sup>11</sup> Whether Hardy had Buckley's *Prometheus* open before him in 1890 or whether it was an unconscious memory of his early days as a student of Greek, I do not know. But I do recall that simple but touching statement on almost the last page of *Jude the Obscure*:

The old superseded Delphin editions of Virgil and Horace, and the dog-eared Greek Testament on the neighboring shelf, and the few other volumes of the sort . . . he had not parted with.

I think that Thomas Hardy had not parted with the Buckley he had used thirty years before.

CARL J. WEBER

COLBY COLLEGE

WATERVILLE, MAINE

### HOMERICA IN *GULLIVER'S TRAVELS*

Swift's indebtedness to classical literature for several ideas that appear in *Gulliver's Travels* has long been recognized.<sup>1</sup> The chief ancient sources are Lucian's *Vera Historia*, from which Swift undoubtedly drew inspiration either directly or indirectly for the

<sup>10</sup> L. Campbell, *Aeschylus: The Seven Plays in English Verse*: Oxford, University Press (1913), 240.

<sup>11</sup> T. A. Buckley, *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*: London, Bohn (1849), 7.

<sup>1</sup> St. J. Basil Wynne Willson, *Lucian's Wonderland, Being a Translation of the 'Vera Historia'*: Edinburgh, William Blackwood and Sons (1899), xiv; F. G. Allinson, *Lucian, Selected Writings*: Boston, Ginn and Co. (1905), 56; and William A. Eddy, *Gulliver's Travels, A Critical Study*: Princeton dissertation (1923), *passim*.

idea of the satiric journey,<sup>2</sup> and the story of the capture of Hercules by pygmies, as told by Philostratus (*Imagines* II, 22), which probably influenced his description of the similar capture of Gulliver by the Lilliputians (pp. 5-13).<sup>3</sup> That Swift was thinking of passages in the *Odyssey* as he wrote certain parts of his work seems probable; but it must be admitted that, though some of the parallels which will be cited are very striking, they do not amount to certain proof of conscious imitation. They are, however, sufficiently interesting to warrant careful consideration.

One notices immediately the general resemblance between the outlines of the *Odyssey* and *Gulliver's Travels*. Both are accounts of extensive voyages in which the chief characters experience many marvelous adventures, meet many strange people, and undergo many great dangers. The hero of each tale has an insatiable hunger for adventure and travel. Odysseus, though longing greatly for home, is nevertheless willing to prolong his absence still further by staying at the court of Alcinous, while Gulliver, having arrived in the Downs on April 13, 1702, after his escape from the Lilliputians, departs from his wife and children in search of more adventure on June 20th of the same year (pp. 71 and 75).

There are several points of resemblance in the Polyphemus episode. The blinding of the Cyclops (*Odyssey* IX, 370-402) may have suggested to Swift the proposal of the Lilliputians to put out the eyes of Gulliver in order to render him less capable of harming them (pp. 60 f.). There is a general similarity between the picture of Polyphemus chasing the ship of Odysseus (*Odyssey* IX, 480-542) and that of the Brobdingnagian giant pursuing the ship of Gulliver's companions into the sea (p. 77). There is perhaps a suggestion of Polyphemus' cannibalism (vss. 287-94) in the idea that occurs to Gulliver as he holds a Lilliputian in his

<sup>2</sup> For other writers who used this idea before Swift's time see the book by Eddy cited above.

<sup>3</sup> The numbers in parentheses refer to the pages of a handy edition of *Gulliver's Travels* published recently, with an introduction by Carl Van Doren, in *The Guild Classics*: New York, Literary Guild of America (no date). Eddy (p. 75) refers to Homer's account of the pigmy empire (*Iliad* III, 4-10), but Swift could have derived little from so meager an account.

hand: "I made a countenance as if I would eat him alive" (p. 17). The Cyclops' bad table manners are suggested by the appetite of Gulliver, which seems like gluttony to the Lilliputians (pp. 8 and 53 f.). Polyphemus' disgust that he should be tricked by so small a man as Odysseus (vss. 513 f.) is reflected perhaps in Gulliver's feeling that, compared with that of Brobdingnagians, his own height is ridiculous (p. 101). The method by which the Cyclops puts Odysseus' companions to death (vss. 288-90), dashing them on the ground, is actually put into the mind of Gulliver by Swift at one point (p. 9).

When one reads of the size of the Brobdingnagian giants (pp. 78 f.), one thinks almost inevitably of Homer's statement concerning the height of the giants, Otus and Ephialtes, who were, at the age of nine, nine cubits broad and nine cubits high (*Odyssey* XI, 311 f.). Glumdalclitch, the child who looked after Gulliver among the Brobdingnagians, was, at the same age, "not above forty feet high, being little for her age" (p. 88). Finally, the scene on the island of Glubbudbrib (pp. 197-201), when Gulliver summons from the dead the departed spirits of Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Caesar, Pompey, Brutus the assassin and his ancestor, Socrates, Epaminondas, Cato the Younger, Sir Thomas More, Homer, and Aristotle, together with the commentators on the last two ancients, calls to mind Odysseus' visit to the abode of the dead and his conversations with the spirits of the heroes in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, though this episode may have come more directly from Lucian's *Vera Historia* iii, 8.

Swift's knowledge of Homer needs no more proof than the following quotation taken from the scene last described (p. 200):

I proposed that Homer and Aristotle might appear at the head of all their commentators; but these were so numerous that some hundreds were forced to attend in the court and outward rooms of the palace. I knew and could distinguish those two heroes at first sight, not only from the crowd but from each other. Homer was the taller and comelier person of the two, walked very erect for one of his age, and his eyes were the most quick and piercing I ever beheld. . . . And I had a whisper from a ghost, who shall be nameless, that these commentators always kept in the most distant quarters from their principals in the lower

world, through a consciousness of shame and guilt, because they had so horribly misrepresented the meaning of those authors to posterity. I introduced Didymus and Eustathius to Homer and prevailed on him to treat them better than perhaps they deserved; for he soon found they wanted a genius to enter into the spirit of a poet.

One of the proposals considered by the Lilliputians to render Gulliver harmless is that they should starve him and so reduce his bulk (p. 62). This idea is similar to a statement of Theocritus (xxii, 112 f.) who says that the giant Amycus boxed with Polydeuces so strenuously all day long that his bulk was reduced to the size of an ordinary mortal. Other classical allusions in *Gulliver's Travels* include references to the Colossus of Rhodes (p. 29) and to Socrates and Plato (p. 277), as well as quotations from Vergil (*Aeneid* II, 79 f.) and from Horace (*Satires* II, 1, 20), neither poet being mentioned by name. GEORGE MCCrackEN

GROVE CITY COLLEGE

#### BENJAMIN FRANKLIN AND RABELAIS

John A. Scott has called attention to Benjamin Franklin's aphorisms (from the Almanacs of July, 1741, and August, 1748, respectively), "Lying rides upon debt's back," and "The second Vice is Lying; the first is running in Debt," which resemble Herodotus' words (I, 138): "They [*sc.* the Persians] regard lying as the most disgraceful thing in the world and next to lying they place running in debt. . . ." Professor Scott concludes that, "It seems hard to believe that Poor Richard was not in some way influenced here by Herodotus."<sup>1</sup>

Parton<sup>2</sup> has suggested that Franklin in his *To the Editor of a Newspaper* (May 20 [1765]) borrowed from Herodotus when he wrote: "The very Tails of the American Sheep are so laden with Wooll, that each has a little Car or Waggon on four little Wheels, to support & keep it from trailing on the Ground."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Herodotus and Benjamin Franklin," *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XXIII (1928), 542.

<sup>2</sup> James Parton, *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*: Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co. (1864), I, 468. Cf. also Herodotus III, 113.

<sup>3</sup> A. H. Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*: New York, Macmillan Co. (ten vols., 1905-07), IV, 368.



To my knowledge there is no conclusive documentary evidence that enables us to show Franklin's reading in Herodotus before 1767, when he writes to Peter Collinson (July 13) and incloses a transcript of a paragraph from Book iv concerning Herodotus' reference to the "sepulchres of the Scythian kings."<sup>4</sup> While it is probable that Franklin knew his Herodotus as early as 1741, it is possible to show that there is reasonable doubt that he borrowed from Herodotus in the above instances noted by Professor Scott.

In the first place, one observes that Franklin looks upon lying as the *second* vice, while Herodotus sees it as the "most disgraceful." One is tempted, upon noting this inversion, to search for an intermediate source from which Franklin could have drawn the Herodotean item.

It seems probable that Rabelais' *Gargantua*, not Herodotus' *History*, furnished Franklin with the above epigrams. (One remembers that Rabelais at the request of Tiraqueau translated one of the books of Herodotus.) In Book III, Chapter v of the *Gargantua* we read:

And I am fully confirmed in the opinion that the Persians erred not when they said that the second vice was to lie, the first being that of owing money. For in very truth debts and lying are ordinarily joined together.<sup>5</sup>

It will be noticed that, unlike the passage as originally given in Herodotus, lying is the second of the vices and hence parallels the order Franklin accords them. Then, too, "joined together" seems to suggest Franklin's "rides upon debt's back." Also, Rabelais gives a version of the sheep that require carts to bear their huge tails. Rabelais notes, however, that he borrowed from Jean Tenaud.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Writings* V, 34. In the 1764 catalog of the Philadelphia Library Company (formed and nurtured by Franklin) there is listed Dr. Littlebury's translation in the second edition, two volumes (London, 1720), of *The History of Herodotus*. I have used the 1764 catalog found in the W. S. Mason collection.

<sup>5</sup> A. J. Nock and C. R. Wilson, *The Urquhart-Le Motteux Translation of the Works of Francis Rabelais*, Edited with an Introduction and Notes: New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co. (1931), I, 453.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* I, 234 and note (*Gargantua*, Bk. I, Ch. xvi).

Hence, there is warrant to believe that in the above instances Franklin used Herodotus as he was refracted through Rabelais.<sup>7</sup>

CHESTER E. JORGENSON

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

### POE'S "TO HELEN" ONCE MORE

Since there seems to be so much interest in some of Poe's phrases in this poem, perhaps it would not be out of place to quote from a recent book<sup>1</sup> by Professor MacLean of the University of Rochester:

What does Poe mean by "Nicaean" barks? As far as I am aware there is no consensus of opinion, despite the fact that much research has been made to find out. . . . May I briefly express my own view by saying that there is not much plausibility in any of these suggestions. It is just as impossible to give a specific interpretation of "Nicaean" as it would be to determine the location of the "perfumed sea." It is an ornamental epithet, which satisfies that aesthetic sense to which all great poetry in places makes an appeal.

R. C. F.

<sup>7</sup> There is a convincing body of evidence, presumptive and direct, which establishes Franklin's knowledge of Rabelais. No. 12 of "The Dogood Papers," printed in No. 58 (Sept. 3—Sept. 10, 1722) of the *New England Courant*, contains a catalog of popular synonyms for "intoxicated"; cf. *Writings* II, 43. As James Parton notes (*op. cit.* I, 221), this list may have been suggested by the word-catalogs in the *Gargantua*. Later, in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, this list is elaborated into "The Drinker's Dictionary"; cf. Parton I, 222-25. No. 494 (May 25, 1738) of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* contains an advertisement of a four-volume edition of Rabelais; quoted in E. C. Cook, *Literary Influences in Colonial Newspapers (1704-1705)*: New York, Columbia University Press (1912), 113. Franklin alludes to and paraphrases Rabelais in a letter to Cadwallader Colden (1751) and in one to Samuel Rhoads (1765); cf. *Writings* III, 35, and IV, 387 f. There is evidence to indicate that Franklin was indebted to Rabelais for some of the items in *Poor Richard's Almanac*; cf. Parton, I, 234, for an example.

Frequently as coarse as his age, by temperament often rude and overly robust, Franklin had a mind of a Rabelaisian cast. For proof of this charge see his letter to the Academy of Brussels suppressed by his latest editor (who is shocked by Franklin's "greasy jests") but "bravely" printed in *The American Collector* III-IV (1926-1927), 112 f.

<sup>1</sup> Robert A. MacLean, *Poets and Poetry*: Rochester, N. Y., The Author (1933), 11.

## Book Reviews

---

[Review copies of classical books should be sent to the Editorial Office of the JOURNAL at Columbia, Mo. Such works will always be listed in the department of Recent Books, and those which seem most important to the readers of the JOURNAL will also be reviewed in this department. The editor-in-chief reserves the right of appointing reviewers.]

MABEL GUDE, *A History of Olynthus*, With a Prosopographia and Testimonia: Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press (1933). Pp. xii + 110. \$2.50.

This, the seventeenth volume of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, sets forth the literary evidence for the history of Olynthus. It comes at a useful time, to accompany the detailed descriptions of the archaeological finds which are being published so promptly under the direction of David M. Robinson, who initiated and directed the excavations. Seven of these volumes have already appeared. To have the results so speedily available is a great satisfaction and help to scholars, even if the editor does thereby inevitably invite some criticism on the grounds of hasty judgment.

This monograph includes quotations or summaries of all the important literary evidence, a list of the Olynthians mentioned in such sources or on coins, a brief general historical survey, and a selected bibliography. Miss Gude accepts as "almost certain" that Myriophyto was the actual site of the classical Olynthus, a theory still questioned by some scholars in view of the lack of any definite confirmatory inscriptions or precise information in ancient texts.

The meagre account of the city's life is neatly pieced together, especially in the chapter devoted to that period of growing prestige and prosperity after the Chalcidians took over the ruined village as a reward for their loyalty to Persia. It is the story of the political and economic expediency of a commercial centre distinguished chiefly for its formation of the Chalcidic League, its

stubborn resistance to Athenian, Spartan, and Macedonian imperialism, and the high materialistic standard of living of its wealthier citizens.

On controversial matters, such as the date of the founding of the Chalcidic League, Miss Gude presents the evidence reasonably, but this reviewer is inclined to agree with Robinson and West that a date earlier than the fourth century is probable.

WALTER R. AGARD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

DAVID M. ROBINSON, *Excavations at Olynthus*, Part V, Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps of Olynthus, Found in 1928 and 1931: Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

This volume, dedicated to the American Council of Learned Societies, is made up of Introduction — Preface, List of Illustrations — comprising pages vii-xxi; text, divided into eight chapters, pages 1-292; index; and plates, I-VII, scattered throughout the text, and 9-209 at the end of the book. The contents of the main body of the text are as follows: Chapter I, Mosaics; Chapter II, Pre-Persian Pottery from Olynthus (by George E. Mylonas); Chapter III, Wares, Mainly Corinthian; Chapter IV, Early Wares of Uncertain Origin; Chapter V, Mainly Attic Black-Figure; Chapter VI, Red-Figured Vases; Chapter VII, Lamps from Olynthus, 1931 (by J. Walter Graham); Chapter VIII, Byzantine Pottery from Olynthus (by A. Xyngopoulos). Chapters I, III, IV, V, and VI are the work of Dr. Robinson. As a whole, the work shows great attention to detail and presents in a thoroughgoing and interesting way the material unearthed at the site.

Perhaps the most interesting part of this interesting work is the chapter on Mosaics. The illustrations in the plates at the end of the work and in the main body of the text are excellent. In the study of the Bellerophon mosaic, the history of the motif of the rider on a rearing horse (pp. 4-6) — on the Parthenon frieze, on fifth-century coins of Perdiccas, and elsewhere down to the first English sovereign, 1817 — gives an indication of the scholarly way in which material is treated throughout the work.

The author has come to the conclusion that vases found on the site of Olynthus are chiefly Olynthian in origin. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that no geometric or Ionic wares were discovered, no Delian-Melian, no Rhodian-Milesian, no Cyrenaic or Laconian (p. vii). In place of these wares is a "new Olynthian style of vases which was developed under the impetus of East Greek fabrics and extended over a long period from 1050 to 479 B.C." (p. vii and pp. 60, 63). Some importations were made, especially of Euboean ware. The author is tempted to consider even the Busiris vase (Pl. 46) an Euboean or Olynthian variety of Attic ware.

All the vases found are dated before 348 B.C. The stamped ware, which might have been assigned by other scholars to an anterior date, the author puts before the middle of the fourth century. The question of dating is vital, for on it the author bases the conclusion that he has to do with Olynthus and not with a Hellenistic city (p. x).

In the discussion of the red-figured vases unearthed the author shows the influence of other artists and other monuments on the technique of the Olynthian ware. This is an interesting phase of the work even if the vases found are so fragmentary as to preclude the dogmatic assertion of parallels. For instance, numbers 129 and 131 show the style of the Midias Painter, and number 112 the influence of the Parthenon frieze and of the balustrade of the Nike Temple. In number 112 the Victory in front view may have been influenced by the Victory of Paeonius (p. 97). As for the vases of the so-called Apulian style, the author points out that they are made of clay which has in it Olynthian mica and that hence it is more likely that these vases were exported from Olynthus to Apulia than that Apulian vases were imported to Olynthus (p. x and p. 149).

As a rule the chapters on vases follow the "notebook style," as is natural in a work that deals so much with details to which no great variety of expression can be given. Yet this style is not uniformly maintained in description, notably in Chapter II as a whole. The usage of scholars does not seem to be uniform in the

pluralizing of names. There is probably no need of a fixed rule, and concessions are always made to the principle of ease. The author gives the plurals "amphoras" (Pl. 160), "lecythi" (Pl. 116), "lagynoi" (Pl. 172), but "oenochoes" (Pl. 165) and "oenochoes" (Pl. 170). These are small matters, however, in a scholarly work.

THOMAS SHEARER DUNCAN

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
ST. LOUIS

STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, United States of America, Fascicule 2, Providence: Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design, Fascicule 1: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1933). Pp. 49 + 31 plates.

Students of vase-painting will universally welcome the appearance of the second fascicule of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* to treat of vases in America, particularly as this volume presents to them the contents of a collection that is relatively little known. It includes some 120 pieces. There are a few sherds, a few undecorated and decorated Roman vases, and a few examples of Egyptian and Mesopotamian wares. The collection contains no Minoan or Cycladic specimens; Cypriote and Late Helladic are represented by a single specimen each. There are upwards of a dozen Corinthian and Italic pieces, one Chalcidian, and four geometric vases.

There is a great preponderance of Attic wares in the collection, and these include some very fine specimens, among which is the red-figured amphora which is the progenitor of Beazley's "Providence Painter" series. The works of several other illustrious artists are here represented. Vases of little or no merit are extremely rare.

Of the illustrations it is enough to say that the high standard of reproduction that one associates with the *Corpus* is well maintained. In one instance, however, justice has scarcely been done to a vase — a little, red-figured alabastron that appears in Pl. 20, no. 3. Concerning the youth that here appears, Luce declares



(p. 27) that he is leaning on a stick; Beazley (*Am. Jour. Arch.* xxxvi [1932], 139) asserts that he is doing no such thing. The photograph is not sufficiently good to enable us to judge betwixt them.

The descriptions of the individual vases are clear, succinct, and accurate, but the Preface is too strongly tintured with garrulity for a work of this nature. And it was surely not necessary in a volume that forms part of a great international undertaking for the benefit of scholars to preface each class of vases with a bibliography that includes regularly even the slight and now old-fashioned notices of Fowler and Wheeler's *Greek Archaeology*.

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS, *Greek Art, The Basis of Later European Art (Our Debt to Greece and Rome)*: New York, Longmans, Green and Co. (1933). Pp. x + 136, with 16 plates. \$1.75.

With this little volume Dr. Fairbanks makes a valuable contribution to the interesting series edited by Professors Hadzsits and Robinson. The titles of the four chapters contained in the book reveal its purpose and scope: I. The Appeal of Greek Art; II. The Greek Tradition: Its Content; III. The Greek Tradition: Its Course; IV. The Spirit of Greek Art.

The appeal of Greek art is immediate and strong, as compared with primitive art, which owes its impulse to a spirit of magic or of play; or with the art of India and China, which is mystical or symbolic; or with the art of Egypt and Mesopotamia, which, while practical, is conventional and strange to us. Our only debt to them is one that we have inherited through Greece, "transformed and recreated by the Greek spirit" (p. 33), whereas "the art of Greece we recognize at once as akin to our own. It is human art, its primary theme the living, thinking, feeling human form" — representing "the meaning of the world and the meaning of life" (p. 34).

The modern debt to Greece in every realm of art is patent to

the most casual observer, be it in architecture, sculpture, painting, pottery, or coinage and other metal work, even to many details of style and technique. "Our debt to Greece, however, lies far deeper. The motivating spirit of art, its nature and its significance are still moulded by this inheritance" (p. 129). All this is succinctly developed in the light of history and philosophy by the learned author who is both philosopher and archaeologist and art historian.

The longest and perhaps the strongest chapter is the fourth, the discussion of the spirit of Greek art, the Greek attitude toward life, and the type of mind that led to that attitude. The following points are developed: (1) Greek art is "communal." The modern artist "works as an individual; he seeks self-expression; his aim is to be original. He paints what he sees or feels. . . . The Greek artist worked as a member of the community, trained in the legacy of its past, inspired by its sympathetic appreciation, seeking to express more and more perfectly its ideals. His statue or painting was successful, not when he expressed himself, but when he expressed the life of the group." Again, (2) the spirit of Greek art is "progressive" — in material, pose, technical skill, vision and understanding of subject, effective design, truth of representation. (3) The spirit of the art of the Greeks is the spirit of humanism. Their primary interest was in man and in what differentiates man from the rest of creation — his ideas and ideals and the human values he found in life (p. 102). On the other hand, (4) the "representation of objects as seen," the keynote of later European art, is also a legacy from Greece. (5) Romanticist and classicist, idealist and realist, in different ways but in like degree, have been profoundly influenced by the arts of Greece.

Thus "through all our shifting schools of art" the influence of Greece (and of Rome as the first heir of Greece) is brought out; and it is inevitable that it should be the art of Greece and Rome that makes the strong appeal that it does make to the modern mind.

The chief fault that any one could find with Professor Fair-

banks' little book would apply to the illustrations. On the sixteen plates at the end of the book are twenty-nine half-tone reproductions of familiar pieces of Greek sculpture. Most of the engraver's work is, unhappily, of a quality unworthy of the book the pictures were meant to adorn. The printer's work is almost beyond criticism; but on page 26 "statutes" for *statues* slipped by, and on page 81 "peninsular" for *peninsula*.

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

MARY V. BRAGINTON, *The Supernatural in Seneca's Tragedies: Menasha, Wisconsin, Collegiate Press* (1933). Pp. 98. \$1.

Of the importance to English literature of the tragedies of Seneca Miss Braginton has this to say:

It was the unexpected lot of this second-rate Roman dramatist to transmit to Renaissance Europe the drama of the Greeks which he himself had tried to reproduce for his own generation. His plays, in spite of their recognized inferiority to Greek drama, will always be of special interest to a student of the development of tragedy.

In her foreword the author calls attention to the frequent use of supernatural agencies of various kinds as one of the striking features of the Senecan tragedies and outlines her present investigation as an attempt "to establish (1) the extent of the use of the supernatural in Seneca, (2) the nature of his treatment of it, (3) the purpose of its employment, and (4) its relation to the supernatural in Greek tragedy." She then proceeds in five chapters (1) to present a description, play by play and in considerable detail, of the supernatural elements in the tragedies; (2) to give an analysis of these elements, in which she finds eight types of usage: ghosts, gods, interpreters of the gods or of fate, magic, divination, visions of supernatural beings, supernatural stage machinery, and dreams.

Of all these types the first mentioned is the most interesting to us since it is well known that the pre-Elizabethan and especially the Shakespearean use of the ghost in tragedy was suggested by Seneca's use of it. It is truly surprising how large a collection of

ghosts Seneca provides, and Miss Braginton is to be thanked for bringing these together.

We must, however, take exception to her statement on page 33, *re* the appearance of the ghost of Achilles in the *Troades* (371-408). Of this the author says:

For dramatic purposes Seneca accepts the ghost without question, though in a choral ode in the *Troades* [see above mentioned lines] *he indicates that he is not in accord with the popular belief in ghosts.* [Italics mine.]

Not so. The lines of this beautiful ode are put into the mouth of the chorus of Trojan women, who seek, by stoutly denying the possibility of the survival of the human spirit, to bolster up their own courage in face of the report that the ghost of Achilles has returned with its horrible demand. Seneca is certainly not speaking in *propria persona* here, and we have no right to attribute the sentiment of the chorus to him.

Chapter III treats of the supernatural in Seneca's prototypes, Chapter IV of the supernatural in Greek tragedy. This careful analysis enables the author to make the following interesting and valuable statement:

The fact that there are only four ghosts in thirty-two extant Greek tragedies as compared with five in the nine plays of Seneca is significant of the Roman tragedian's supernatural practice . . . though in ghost usage Seneca did not actually invent a new type.

The final chapter (V) gives a brief review of the supernatural element in the *Octavia*, which play, however, Miss Braginton does not admit into the Senecan canon but which she does consider as akin to the others in its liberal employment of the supernatural.

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER

DENVER, COLORADO

## Hints for Teachers

---

[Edited by Dorothy M. Bell of Oberlin, Ohio. The aims of this department are threefold: to assist the inexperienced teacher of Latin, to help the experienced teacher keep in touch with matters of interest in the professional world, and to serve as a receiving center and distributing point for questions and contributions on teaching problems. Questions will be answered by mail or in the pages of this department. Contributions in the form of short paragraphs dealing with projects, tests, interest devices, methods, and materials are requested. Anything intended for publication should be typed on stationery of regular size. All correspondence should be addressed to the editor of this department.]

### Latin Newspapers — Request for Information

It would seem that Latin newspapers in the schools and colleges are on the increase. To those already on file in this office must be added the *Praeco* published by the students of the M. S. Hershey Junior-Senior High School, Hershey, Pennsylvania. It made its initial appearance in January of this year. "Many of the articles are the result of class exercises and projects" and only occasionally represent the work of an individual. They are of a more or less general nature. This first issue contains among other things a short story in Italian, designed to show that Latin is an aid in reading languages of today, an original Latin poem, a short play with original illustrations, and an original *Aenigma Verborum*.

The growing number of these newspapers inspires this editor to compile for publication in this department a list of the Latin papers now being published in schools and colleges. For this purpose the editor requests publishers of such papers to forward the following information:

- (1) the name of the paper;
- (2) by what group and where it is published;
- (3) how long the paper has been published;
- (4) how often it is published;
- (5) what language is employed — Latin or English or both.

**A Latin Tournament**

From Mrs. Lillian P. Wood of Goshen High School, Goshen, Virginia, comes a suggestion for a contest which was staged with great success in her Latin Club. The contestants were the members of the first-year class (divided into Sections A and B) and the second-year class. Each group was headed by a captain who saw to the scoring and averaging of the papers corrected by his team. The material for competition was a list of twenty-five different nouns covering the case forms of all the declensions. These were written on the board in the following manner: (1) of the seas, (2) the river — direct object, (3) days — subject, (4) to the king, etc. The pupils competed both sectionally and individually at the same time. The stake was an entertainment of Latin recitations, readings, and songs, to be given by the losing to the winning class.

During the contest the second-year class sat between Sections A and B of the first-year group. On the first round Section A exchanged papers with the second-year team. This team exchanged in turn with Section B. Thus Section B's papers were in active competition with those of the second-year group, while Section B merely held the papers of its rival, Section A, and rated them only for individual scores. In the second round Section B exchanged with the second-year class, which then exchanged with Section A. This time Section A's papers competed against the second-year papers, while Section B's papers were held by Section A and were not scored in the group competition. In this way the second-year class was matched each time with only one section of the first-year class. Yet in each round all the contestants were kept busy in individual competition. After each round individual scores and sectional or class averages were recorded. At the end of the contest these individual and class averages were compared to determine the winners.

It is interesting to note that, while the second-year class won both individual and class honors, the margin of victory was a very close one. The winning second-year individual average score was a perfect 100, with a first-year average score of 98 running



a close second. The class averages were almost as close. The second-year team won with 88.3, Section A of the first-year had 85.4, while Section B was but one point behind with 84.4. Mrs. Wood writes:

So interested were these classes, that they called for three different contests. The principal assisted and the county superintendent was present. In fact, the whole school was keenly aroused and other teachers put on similar contests. The improvement in interest in Latin extended even to the entire community.

#### **Mythology at the World's Fair**

An attractive little leaflet that has come to this desk recently is one called *Arcturus*. It was distributed at the World's Fair by the Arcturus Radio Tube Company of Newark, New Jersey. We note with satisfaction the really very large contribution that mythology has made to the readability of this advertising pamphlet.

The first section of the leaflet offers an explanation of how Arcturus was able to open the Fair. The remaining pages are devoted to a description of "Arcturus and Its Myths." Because of the widespread interest aroused in Arcturus in this Fair year we feel that many will be glad to have reprinted here excerpts from the mythological background presented in this booklet.

Astronomy is probably the oldest of the sciences, and the ancients, in their endeavor to gain a conception of immortality, observed the immutability of the heavens and so enthroned their gods and immortals as stars in the firmament. And, as these early astronomers, astrologers, and simple shepherds watched the course of the stars across the sky with the awe of viewing their gods, the constellations took on forms significant of the deeds or occupations of the immortals concerned.

The star Arcturus is the celestial herald of spring. Its appearance above the horizon early in March foretells, as it foretold to the ancients, the awakening of nature. . . . It was a sign for the plowman to begin his activities, and it was natural that Boötes, after whom its constellation is named, be credited with the invention of the plow. In this legend the Great Bear, or Big Dipper, is interpreted as a primitive plow and Boötes as a plowman since the latter constellation endlessly tracks the Big Dipper through the heavens.

This particular myth relates how Boötes, having been robbed of his

earthly possessions by his brother and being of an industrious nature, tilled the soil from early dawn until dusk. At night he would sit in the starlight and dream of an implement more suited to breaking the soil than his primitive plow. As the result of his dreams he invented the plow and with the aid of two oxen quickly regained his lost fortune. . . .

Greek mythology, however, was responsible for the name Arcturus, which translated means Guardian of the Bear, the Bear being Ursa Major, or the Big Dipper. This myth tells how Callisto, an Arcadian maiden, was an attendant upon Artemis (better known as Diana), goddess of the chase and chaste. . . . Zeus, the king of the gods, became enamored of Callisto; and because of her deflection from the vows of Artemis, she was changed by the goddess into the Great Bear. Enraged at the punishment dealt out by Artemis, Zeus retaliated by placing Arcturus in the heavens as a guardian of the Bear to protect her from Artemis. As a consequence, among the Greeks Arcturus . . . is shown with the hunting spear in one hand and with the other holding the leash of the hunting dogs, forever following his charge.

#### Word Ancestry

We think of "edification" as meaning, in a general way, instruction, or the imparting of knowledge, but it means much more than that. "Edify" and "edification" are used a number of times in the New Testament, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul. *Aedificare* means "to build a house" — *aedes* + *facere*. To edify a person is to build him up and not only that but to build him up just as a house is built; that is, to impart to him knowledge not at random but in a constructive way, so that it fits together and means something. The materials that go into a building must fit together. This word is well applied to moral or religious instruction.

But, it may be suggested, it was not St. Paul who used these words but the translators, because St. Paul wrote his letters in Greek. That is true, but if we turn to the Greek Testament, we shall find that he used the word οἰκοδομεῖν, which means exactly the same as *aedificare*, "to build a house." And if we should turn to the Latin Testament, the Vulgate, we should find that the word there used is *aedificare*, which, in "edify," we have taken without much change into English.

WILLIS A. ELLIS

LOMBARD, ILLINOIS

**Latin vs. English as Difficult — A Latin Play**

A complaint often voiced by the beginning Latin pupil is that Latin forms are so much more irregular and full of exceptions than are those of his own English language. He asserts in all sincerity that English is easy as compared with the forms that Roman boys had to master.

An exceedingly interesting and effective way of refuting this contention on the part of the pupil has been used successfully by Charles W. Bangert of Leelanau School for Boys, Glen Arbor, Michigan. He has written a playlet which he calls *Historia Mutata* or "History in Reverse." In the foreword he writes: "Some dashing Americans discovered Europe in 1492 A.D. After many years of relentless warfare had passed they forced their language upon the conquered lands. Defenseless children were made to study English long after it had ceased to be spoken by any living person."

The scene of the play is a schoolroom in Rome A.U.C. DCXCIV. The pupils are struggling with an English lesson. Some complain that it is a dead language which they have to take merely because their parents insist they'll get something out of it some day. Others are laboriously reciting the English alphabet, the principal parts of English verbs, and the present tense of the verb "to be." Suddenly Caesar and Cicero make a surprise call upon them. Caesar tells them how he once thought English hard. Now, however, he is glad he can read about the great English and American heroes. He hopes that some day in Gaul he may be able to say as Perry said, "We have met the enemy and they are ours." The pupils are thrilled by him. Cicero exclaims over the great orators of the past, Lincoln, Webster, Burke, and others. After bidding the boys "*Studete, laborate*," he concludes with the stirring words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." As the two great men depart the boys set to work with enthusiasm to learn their English forms. The playlet closes as Marcus begins to read from his English book, "Once upon a time there was a little boy named George Washington. One day his father gave him a hatchet for his birthday. Then . . ."

It is not the general policy of the JOURNAL to publish Latin playlets and skits because of lack of space. However, in this instance, the editor of this department is prompted by the cleverness of Mr. Bangert's idea to invite others who feel inclined to do so to submit *short* original sketches or playlets which confute the pupils' argument that the Latin language is so much more irregular in form than English is. Such a skit might easily and profitably be worked out in the classroom in the weeks still left in the school year. The editor will be glad to consider all contributions sent in by the first of July. The best one submitted will appear in this department in the October issue of the next volume of the JOURNAL.

#### Another Latin Newspaper

We are glad to acknowledge receipt of the December issue of *Vox in Desertis Clamans*, founded by the second-year Latin students of the University of Mississippi and published by all the Latin classes, the Latin Club, and the local chapter of Eta Sigma Phi. It is a four-page, multigraphed sheet and is written for the most part in Latin. Its editorial is a worth-while article in English on "Why Continue Latin in College?" It contains articles in Latin on campus activities, the local chapter and the national convention of Eta Sigma Phi, the meeting of the Mississippi Classical Association, the Latin Club, the Mississippi-City College football game. For the benefit of any one who may desire to bring football into the Latin class the positions in the line-up are here quoted:

Left end	<i>Sinister extremus</i>	Right tackle	<i>Dexter obstructor</i>
Left tackle	<i>Sinister obstructor</i>	Right end	<i>Dexter extremus</i>
Left guard	<i>Sinister protector</i>	Quarterback	<i>Dux</i>
Center	<i>Medius</i>	Left halfback	<i>Sinister aggressor</i>
Right guard	<i>Dexter protector</i>	Right halfback	<i>Dexter aggressor</i>
	Fullback	<i>Praecipitator</i>	

The first page bears an interesting representation of the *Spiritus Saturnalis*. The paper is an excellent piece of work and another proof that Latin yet lives and thrives.

## Current Events

---

[Edited by Clarence W. Gléason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., and John Barker Stearns, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; George Howe, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., for the Southeastern States; Eugene Tavenner, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; for the Southwestern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Frederic S. Dunn, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.]

This department will present everything that is properly news of general appeal, but considerations of space compel the editor to ask that items be made as brief as possible. Whenever feasible, it is preferable to print programs of meetings which would draw an attendance from a large area as live news in advance of the date rather than as dead news after the event. In this connection it should be remembered that the December issue, e.g., appears on November fifteenth and that items must be in hand five or six weeks in advance of this date.]

### **An Announcement and an Appeal**

The Service Bureau for Classical Teachers of the American Classical League was organized eleven years ago not for profit but for service. Its one purpose has been to serve the needs of classical teachers in the secondary schools and students preparing to teach. The financial returns from those served have regularly been less than the cost of the service rendered. Generous financial support from educational foundations and educational institutions has in the past made it possible for the League to provide for the director's salary and to make good any unusual expense in the operation of the Bureau itself.

During the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, however, the League and the Service Bureau will receive \$4000 less support from an outside source than it is receiving during the present fiscal year. The efficiency of the Bureau, therefore, not to say its continued operation, is seriously threatened.

At a special meeting of the Council of the League, held in New York February 2, 1934, to consider plans for meeting this emergency, it was decided to ask each member of the League to make a gift of \$1.00 a year for the next three years for an Emergency Fund (over and above the \$1.00 for annual membership). Each member is also asked to secure,

if possible, one or more new members for the League. The Council voted down a proposal to increase the annual membership dues and to increase the charge for mimeographed and printed material sold by the Bureau.

Your officers wish to assure you that the work of the League and the Bureau is being carried on as economically as it is possible to carry it on and that all gifts to the Emergency Fund will be devoted directly to the maintenance of the Bureau.

W. L. CARR  
President

ROLLIN H. TANNER  
Secretary

#### University of Iowa

The sixteenth annual conference of classical teachers was held at Iowa City on Friday and Saturday, February 16-17, with a large number of Latin teachers from Iowa and near-by states in attendance. The program included the following addresses: "Underground Palestine" (illustrated), Leroy Waterman, University of Michigan; "The Education of a Citizen" and "The Humanities and the Curriculum of the Schools," G. J. Laing, University of Chicago; "Recent Trends in the Teaching of Secondary Latin," Helen M. Eddy, University of Iowa; "A Summer in Greece" (illustrated), Minnie Keys Flickinger, University of Iowa; "When Greek Meets Greek," C. A. Ruckmick, University of Iowa; "Pre-historic Researches in Attica" (illustrated), George E. Mylonas, Washington University; "The Spartan-Roman Affinity," John M. Bridgham, Grinnell College; "Roman Private Life as Seen in the Works of Vergil," Ruby M. Hickman, University of Iowa; "Greek Vases of the Corinthian Style" (illustrated), William S. Ebersole, Cornell College; "Contemporary Events in Horace," Sarah E. Bohan, Waterloo High School; "Cicero's Successful Defense of Obviously Guilty Clients," Dorcas F. Howard, Des Moines; "Realism in Latin Teaching," Mark E. Hutchinson, Cornell College; "The Perennial Schoolmaster," Lane Cooper, Cornell University; "Roman Remains in Southern France" (illustrated), Oscar E. Nybakken, University of Iowa; "The Reading Method and Latin—Can We, and Do We Want To?" Franklin H. Potter, University of Iowa; "Latin in the State Academic Contest," Marguirette Struble, University of Iowa.



## Recent Books<sup>1</sup>

[Compiled by Russel M. Geer, Brown University.]

- BAYNES, CHARLOTTE A., *The Coptic Gnostic Treatise Contained in the Codex Brucianus*, A Translation from the Coptic Transcript, with Commentary: New York, Macmillan Co.; Cambridge, England, University Press (1933). Pp. xxv + 229, with 117 collotype reproductions. \$10; 30s.
- BECKENSTEIN, MAURICE, and ORMOND, S., *Student's Manual of Ancient and Medieval History*: New York, Regents Publishing Co. (1933). Pp. 104. \$0.50.
- BONNER, ROBERT J., *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* (Sather Classical Lectures, 1932): Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press (1933). Pp. 200. \$2.25.
- BURTON, ORMOND E., *Study in Creative History, The Interaction of the Eastern and Western Peoples to 500 B.C.*: New York, Peter Smith (1933); London, George Allen and Unwin (1932). Pp. 320. \$3.50; 10s. 6d.
- BURY, R. G., *Sextus Empiricus*, With an English Translation, Vol. I, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, William Heinemann (1933). Pp. xlv + 514. \$2.50; 10s.
- BUTLER, H. E., and BARBER, E. A., *The Elegies of Propertius*, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary: New York, Oxford University Press; Oxford, University Press (1933). Pp. lxxxiv + 408. \$6.50.
- BYRNES, SISTER ELIZABETH JOSEPH, *Aid in the Study of Latin*<sup>2</sup>, Two Years: Syracuse, The Author. \$0.45.
- CLENDON, ARTHUR, and VINCE, J. H., *Clarendon Latin Course*, Key to Part I (First and Second Years): Oxford, University Press (1933). Pp. 88. 5s.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, United States of America, Fascicule 4; Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md., Fascicule 1, by David Moore Robinson with the Assistance of Mary W. McGehee: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1934). Pp. 58 + 48 plates. \$5.00.

<sup>1</sup> Including books received at the Editorial Office of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, Columbia, Mo.

- CUMMINS, GERALDINE D., *Great Days of Ephesus*, With an Introduction by E. B. Gibbes (Scripts of Cleophas, Vol. III): London, Rider and Co. (1933). Pp. 212. 7s. 6d.
- DELOUGAZ, P., *Plano-Convex Bricks and the Methods of Their Employment and The Treatment of Clay Tablets in the Field* (University of Chicago Oriental Institute Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, No. 7): Chicago, University of Chicago Press (1933). Pp. xi + 57. \$1.
- ELLIS, WILLIS A., *Word Ancestry*<sup>2</sup>: Chicago, Daily News (1934). Pp. 47. \$0.10.
- FORBES, CLARENCE ALLAN, *NEOI*, A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations (Philological Monographs, No. II): Middletown, Conn., American Philological Association (1933). Pp. x + 76.
- FOXLEY, CHARLES, *Verse Translations from Lucretius*: Cambridge, England, W. Heffer and Sons (1933). Pp. viii + 98. 3s. 6d.
- GARDNER, ERNEST A., *Poet and Artist in Greece*: London, Gerald Duckworth and Co. (1933). Pp. 132. 5s.
- GLOVER, TERROT R., *The World of the New Testament* (Cambridge Miscellany, No. 12): Cambridge, England, University Press (1933). Pp. xiv + 192. 3s. 6d.
- GOODACRE, HUGH G., *Handbook of the Coinage of the Byzantine Empire*, 3 parts: London, Spink and Son (1928-33). Pp. 60, 184, 120. 5s., 10s., 8s.
- GRAY, MASON D., and JENKINS, THORNTON, *Latin for Today*, Second-Year Course, Revised Edition: Boston, Ginn and Co. (1934). Pp. xxi + 546 + 206. \$1.80.
- GULICK, CHARLES BURTON, *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists*, With an English Translation, Vol. V (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, William Heinemann (1933). Pp. xii + 550, 12 illustrations. \$2.50; 10s.
- HENNES, WILLIAM R., *Vocabulary of Vergil's Aeneid, Book III* (Loyola Vocabularies): Chicago, Loyola University Press (1933). Pp. 31. \$0.12.
- HURLBUT, STEPHEN A., *With Caesar in France*, Being the Narrative of a Personally Conducted Tour through the Seventh Book of *The Gallic War*: Washington, D.C., St. Albans Press (1933). Pp. 24. \$1.
- IRVINE, A. L., *Cicero's Correspondence*, A Selection: Cambridge, England, University Press (1933). Pp. xx + 272. 4s. 6d.
- JACK, JAMES W., *Historic Christ*, An Examination of Robert Eisler's Theory According to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and Other Sources: London, James Clarke (1933). Pp. 284. 8s. 6d.
- JAMES, R. L., *Roman Friendship*, Cicero and Sulpicius, *Ninth Philippic and Ad Familiares XIII, 17; IV, 1, 5-6, 12*, With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary: Oxford, University Press (1933). Pp. 128. 1s. 9d.

- JENKINS, EDGAR B., *Index Verborum Terentianus*: Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press (1932). Pp. x + 188. \$2.
- KAEGI, ADOLF, *Short Grammar of Classical Greek*<sup>17</sup>, With Tables for Repetition, Translated by James A. Kleist: St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co. (1933). Pp. 8 + 260. \$1.50.
- KASE, EDMUND H., JR., *A Papyrus Roll in the Princeton Collection*: New York, G. E. Stechert and Co. (1933). Pp. 36. \$2.50.
- KNIGHT, A. H. J., *Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche*, And Particularly of His Connection with Greek Literature and Thought: New York, Macmillan Co.; Cambridge, England, University Press (1933). Pp. viii + 194. \$3.75; 10s. 6d.
- LATHROP, HENRY BURROWES, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 35): Madison, University of Wisconsin (1933). Pp. 350.
- LUCE, HARRY K., *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, With Introduction and Notes (Cambridge Greek Testament): Cambridge, England, University Press (1933). Pp. xxxii + 384. 7s. 6d.
- MCCLEES, HELEN, *Daily Life of the Greeks and Romans*<sup>8</sup>, As Illustrated in the Classical Collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, with Additions by C. Alexander: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (1933). Pp. xviii + 143, with 192 illustrations. \$1.
- MACDONALD, HELEN S., *Kalendarium Romanum*: Lancaster, Penn., The Author (1933). Pp. 12. \$0.60.
- MATTINGLY, HAROLD, and SYDENHAM, E. D., Editors, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, Vol. V, Part 2, by Percy H. Webb: London, Spink and Son (1933). Pp. 700, with 20 plates. 55s.
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, Vol. IV, Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia, Edited by W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder, and W. K. C. Guthrie (American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor Publications): Manchester, England, University of Manchester Press (1933). Pp. xx + 144, with 71 plates. 40s.
- OLDFATHER, C. H., *Diodorus Siculus*, With an English Translation, Vol. I (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, William Heinemann (1933). Pp. xxviii + 470. \$2.50; 10s.
- OSBORNE, C. H. C., and JAEGER, B. L., *Comparative Table of the Verb in English, German, Latin, French, Spanish, Greek*: Cambridge, England, W. Heffer and Sons (1933). Pp. 8. 6d.
- OWEN, S. G., *The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1933*, Edited for the Council of the Classical Association: Bristol and London, J. W. Arrowsmith (1933). Pp. xii + 106. 3s. 6d.
- ROBINSON, C. E., *Everyday Life in Ancient Greece*: New York, Oxford

- University Press; Oxford, University Press (1933). Pp. 160, 50 illustrations. \$1.50.
- ROBSON, E. ILIFF, Arrian, With an English Translation, Vol. II, *Anabasis Alexandri* (Books v-vii), *Indica* (Book viii) (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, William Heinemann (1933). Pp. viii + 446, 3 maps. \$2.50; 10s.
- ROSE, H. I., *Hygini Fabulae*, Recensuit, Prolegomenis Commentario Appendice Instruxit: Lugduni Batavorum, A. W. Sijthoff (1933). Pp. xxxii + 218. 10.50 fl.
- SCHLIEFFEN, ALFRED, *Cannae*: Fort Leavenworth, Kas., Command and General Staff School (1931). Pp. xv + 306, with portfolio of 101 maps. \$3.
- SPARGO, JOHN WEBSTER, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, Vol. X): Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1934). Pp. xii + 502. \$5.00.
- STEPHENS, GEORGE R., *Knowledge of Greek in England in the Middle Ages*: Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press (1933). Pp. 167.
- STURTEVANT, EDGAR H., *Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Special Publications, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series): Philadelphia, Linguistic Society of America (1933). Pp. 320. \$4.50.
- SYDENHAM, EDWARD A., *Coinage of Caesarea in Cappadocia*: London, Spink and Son (1933). Pp. 138. 12s.
- WRIGHT, F. A., *Select Letters of St. Jerome*, With an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; London, William Heinemann (1933). Pp. xvi + 510. \$2.50; 10s.
- WRIGHT, FREDERICK A., *Romance of Life in the Ancient World*: London, Sampson Low, Marston and Co. (1933). Pp. 336. 6s.
- YOUNG, GERARD MACKWORTH, *The Epigrams of Callimachus*, Text with Translations into English Verse: New York, Oxford University Press (1934). Pp. xvi + 142. \$2.50.